Andrew Mitchell, 'new diplomatic history', and cultural networks in Britain and Europe

by

David B. Taylor, BA (Hons)

School of Humanities

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy

University of Tasmania

November 2018

Declaration of originality

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for a degree or diploma by the University or any other institution, except by way of background information and duly acknowledged in the thesis, and to the best of my knowledge and belief no material previously published or written by another person except where due acknowledgement is made in the text of the thesis, nor does the thesis contain any material that infringes copyright.

David B. Taylor

Authority of access

This thesis is not to be made available for loan or copying for two years following the date this statement was signed. Following that time the thesis may be made available for loan and limited copying and communication in accordance with the Copyright Act 1968.

Acknowledgements

In writing this thesis, or any work of substance, one inevitably incurs debts that may not be able to be repaid. Such is my position in completing this thesis. The people here noted comprise only a small section of the many people I spoke, debated and laughed with during the course of the last three years. Lack of space prevents me from listing everyone here but suffice to say that even if you are not on this page, you know who you are and I thank you very much for being part of this phase of my career.

I would first like to thank my supervisors, Professor Michael Bennett and Dr. Anthony Page, whose valuable expertise, guidance, patience, and wisdom have brought my work to this point. From the moment I approached them about supervising this PhD, they have been interested, enthusiastic, and supportive. They corrected me when necessary and encouraged me when it was not expected. At times, the writing of a PhD thesis flows smoothly. At other times, it is like staring up at the north face of the Matterhorn. I thank my supervisors for being there.

I am thankful also for the time given to me by Dr. Esther Mijers and Dr. Adam Budd of the University of Edinburgh, who took the time to meet with me during my archival research. Dr. Budd's enthusiasm for my project added great momentum at such an early stage. I would also like to acknowledge the kind assistance provided to me at the various archives I visited during my research. The permission of Alexandra Burnett at Kemnay, and the assistant provided by archivists Duncan and Michael on a frenetic research trip, was vital. The opportunities for research and conference attendance afforded by support from the University of Tasmania have also been integral to my research.

I cannot neglect this opportunity to also thank my wife Amy, whose support and encouragement in this life pursuit has been wonderful to the point of absurdity. I thank also my parents Jenny and Cliff, and my parents-in-law Gail and Kees, and the rest of my family, for their support, interest, and thoughts on this process. It certainly has been smoothed by some good bottles of wine and conversation.

Last but not least I would like to thank, in no particular order, my fellow postgraduates Rickie, Paige, Audrey, Ryleigh, Imogen, and Evan for their banter and light-heartedness. The journey for some is over, and for others, the end is in sight. I wish you all luck in your careers. To the staff in the school of History and Classics who have guided my path at various stages – Stefan Petrow, Kristyn Harman, Elizabeth Freeman – thank you for your support of myself and the postgraduates. We appreciate your stabilising serenity.

Contents

Notes

Transcription of quotations and original documents

Quotations from all sources have maintained original spelling conventions, grammar, and punctuation. There is a marked difference in capitalisation and spelling errors in original texts, compared to modern English. To spare the reader excessive editorial interventions, spelling mistakes in original texts have been left in and are intentional – 'sic' has not been employed. The titles of works deemed 'primary sources', i.e., printed before 1900, have their original capitalisation, punctuation and grammar.

Translations

Authentic and credible translations have been used where possible. I have undertaken all translations from German and French. French translations contain the original French in the footnote, to denote the author's lower expertise in this field.

Dating conventions

The Julian calendar was in usage in Britain until 1752, when the Gregorian calendar was formally adopted. The Julian calendar was 11 days ahead of the Gregorian calendar, resulting in an overlap of dating conventions. Eighteenth-century Britons often utilised 'Old Style' (OS) or 'New Style' (NS) to demarcate dates. They sometimes also utilised dual dates, such as 8 January 1741/2 or 28/17 March 1752. All dates in this thesis are given as the author of the documents gives them. I have only denoted 'OS' or 'NS' where the author themselves has done so.

Abbreviations

BL	British Library
EUL	Edinburgh University Library
Memoirs	Andrew Bisset, ed, *Memoirs and Papers of Sir Andrew Mitchell, K. B. Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary from the court of Great Britain to the court of Prussia, from 1756 to 1771*, 2 vols. (London, 1854).
NAK	National Archives, Kew
NLS	National Library of Scotland
NRS	National Records of Scotland
ODNB	Oxford Dictionary of National Biography
Oeuvres	*Oeuvres de Frédéric le Grand*, ed. J. D. E. Preuss, 30 vols. (Berlin, 1846-1856).
Pol. Corr	*Die politische Corresponz Friedrichs des Grossen*, 46 vols. (Berlin, 1879-1939).
RS	Royal Society of London
SP	State Papers, Prussia (at the National Archives, Kew)

Abstract

This thesis examines the career of British diplomat Andrew Mitchell (1708-1771) in the context of 'new diplomatic history'. This emerging sub-field of diplomatic history has strong links to the greater emergence of cultural history over the last two or three decades. It is interested in the lives of diplomats outside of signing treaties, attending conferences, and paying court to rulers and kings. Therefore, this thesis utilises Mitchell's cultural pursuits – defined as his interests in science and literature – to place new emphasis on his political career in London, and his diplomatic mission to Prussia from 1756-1771. The key aim of the thesis is to argue that Mitchell's diplomatic mission was predominantly carried out as a form of cultural diplomacy, in which Mitchell forged strong links with Prussia's ruler, Frederick II (the Great) through their shared intellectual and cultural interests.

The thesis is structured almost entirely in chronological order, but as the chapters are presented in a thematic way, there is some chronological overlap. As in reality, where Mitchell's interests intersected and overlapped with those of Frederick, Britain, and their respective courts, this thesis seeks to shed light on the factors that allowed Britain and Prussia to maintain a diplomatic relationship throughout the Seven Years War (1756-63). One of the key reasons, this thesis argues, was Mitchell's way of conducting his diplomacy. Interspersed with the obvious political duties incumbent upon Mitchell in Prussia was an awareness that becoming closer to Frederick on an intellectual and philosophical level could be of some advantage to the alliance.

Chapter 1 is an introduction, and Chapters 2 and 3 provide both new research and evidence on Mitchell's early life and greater context for the argument that Mitchell carried out cultural diplomacy. Chapter 4 argues that Mitchell successfully developed an intellectual network between Britain and Prussia, drawing upon that he had already established in Britain to create a new one in Prussia. In doing so, his mission to Prussia was characterised from the outset as one with deep roots in the power of culture to affect change at the highest levels. With the cultural credit of being a friend of the poet James Thomson and the philosopher/historian David Hume, Mitchell made quick headway among the burgeoning German intellectual and literary world at this time.

The central elements of science and literature in diplomacy are addressed in Chapters 5 and 6. It is argued that not only did Mitchell not consider science to be a tool of specific states or kingdoms, he freely shared his access to inventors and their inventions, to scientists and their experiments, with his Prussian friends in a way that built up his cultural credentials and established him as a nexus figure in Prussian and German interests in British science. When it came to literature, Mitchell's aforementioned friendships and connections placed him in high standing, and won him the attentions of leading German Enlightenment figures such as Lessing, Gellert, Sulzer, and Euler. In promoting German authors to the avowedly Francophile Frederick, Mitchell tackled Frederick's derisory view of German literature through his privileged diplomatic access and status. These two chapters demonstrate the power of this form of diplomacy to place Mitchell and Britain as key elements of Frederick's cultural thinking.

Chapter 7 brings the thesis to a head by returning to the political elements which form both the foundation of Mitchell's mission, his *raison d'etre*, and which ultimately overpowered the cultural elements of his diplomacy. It is argued here that cultural diplomacy was successful insofar as the political situation reflected the relative isolation of Britain and Prussia, but that the practice of cultural diplomacy could not withstand the exigencies of the reality of politics, and that it fractured when Frederick's biggest threat, Russia, was neutralised with a change of ruler. These ultimately eroded Britain's alliance with Prussia, therefore undermining the cultural elements which Mitchell had pushed for the duration of his mission.

Chapter 1

Introduction

> One wise thing the English have done: sent an Excellency Mitchell, a man of loyalty, of sense and honesty, to be their Resident at Berlin. This is the noteworthy, not yet much noted, Sir Andrew Mitchell; by far the best Excellency England ever had in that Court. An Aberdeen Scotchman, creditable to his Country: hard-headed, sagacious; sceptical of shows; but capable of recognising substances withal, and of standing loyal to them, stubbornly if needful; who grew to a great mutual regard with Friedrich, and well deserved to do so; constantly about him, during the next seven years; and whose Letters are among the perennially valuable Documents on Friedrich's History … [The Mitchell Papers] should certainly, and will one day, be read to the bottom, and cleared of their darknesses, extrinsic and intrinsic (which are considerable), by somebody competent.[1]
>
> *Thomas Carlyle on Andrew Mitchell and the value of his papers*

> Diplomatic history is often written uniquely in terms of major negotiations which produce (or, more often, fail to produce) alliances, of political crises involving questions of peace and war, of frequent conferences on matters of major importance. Such subjects are – rightly – the main focus of attention; yet this necessarily selective emphasis also contains one obvious danger; it may produce a distorted picture of the duties and day-to-day difficulties of a diplomat by conveying (albeit unconsciously) an impression of the ambassador's life as one of continual conferences and despatches concerned solely with major political events.[2]
>
> *H. M. Scott*

i. Andrew Mitchell (1708-1771): A brief life and career summary

Who was Andrew Mitchell and why does his career warrant further study? It is the premise of this thesis that, from a broad view of Mitchell's career, certain elements and currents can be more clearly defined in order to assist scholars in learning more about this historical period. More than this, this thesis takes Mitchell's diplomatic service and adds to it a strong cultural emphasis. Taking this is a central premise requires the context of Mitchell's career and education.

---

[1] Thomas Carlyle, *History of Friedrich II. of Prussia, called Frederick the Great*, Vol. 5 (Boston, 1884), pp. 309-310 and n.
[2] H. M. Scott, 'Anglo-Austrian relations after the Seven Years' War: Lord Stormont in Vienna, 1763-1772', PhD thesis (University of London, 1977), p. 208.

Andrew Mitchell was born on 15 April 1708, the son of Edinburgh clergyman Reverend William Mitchell (1670-1727), and his wife, Margaret Stewart (died during or before 1723). William Mitchell was from a wealthy and influential family, and was a prominent member of the Scottish Presbyterian church. Minister of the Canongate and then St. Giles's churches in Edinburgh, William was also one of the King's chaplains for Scotland and on many occasions moderator of the general assembly.[3] Andrew's mother also hailed from an influential family, as her father had been Lord Provost of Edinburgh.[4] On 7 August 1722, Mitchell was married to his second-cousin Barbara Forbes, when he was aged fourteen and she twelve. The marriage was probably one made in consideration of the fortune and position of the bride, as Barbara was heir to substantial estates including that at Thainston in Aberdeenshire.[5] This is supported by the fact that the average age of marriage for men and woman in Scotland between 1700 and 1749 was 27.5 and 26.2 years respectively.[6] This idea is also reinforced by his widowed father's re-marriage, one year later, to Barbara's mother, also called Barbara, and brought the family into even closer connection with the influential Forbes family. Mitchell's wife died in 1726 during or shortly after childbirth, and their daughter died soon thereafter, leaving Mitchell a widower at eighteen.[7] His father died in 1727 and from this, and the estates of his late wife, Mitchell would draw considerable income for the remainder of his life.

Mitchell studied civil law and history at the University of Edinburgh from 1725 to 1725. It was there that he forged some of his strongest social and learned connections, including being a member of the Rankenian Club, one of the brightest intellectual clubs of Scotland in the early eighteenth century. Two of the earliest influences on Mitchell's thinking, moral and political outlook, and character makeup were present at this time and continued to be so for a number of years: Charles Mackie, the first Professor of Universal History at Edinburgh, and George Turnbull. Both Mackie and Turnbull were involved in Mitchell's life at the same time. Mackie was his teacher, his friend, and later, his correspondent. Turnbull was a friend and correspondent and, later, a travelling tutor to Mitchell. They all shared a common participation in the Rankenian Club, the details of Mitchell's role in which is outlined in Chapter 2 of this thesis, when it will be argued that the Rankenians were known to be open to more radical religious and philosophical views.[8] Both Mackie and Turnbull also held strong views about the teaching of students at Edinburgh and in Scotland more generally, and wrote extensively on these views in order to expand the

[3] Examples of William Mitchell's business as a moderator of the general assembly and as a minister representing Scotland at home and in London, see 'Diary of the Rev. William Mitchell, Minister at Edinburgh', in *The Miscellany of the Spalding Club*, Vol. 1 (Aberdeen, 1841), pp. 227-253.
[4] H. M. Scott, 'Mitchell, Sir Andrew (1708-1771)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (ODNB), at https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/18833, accessed 22 August 2018.
[5] Andrew Bisset, ed, *Memoirs and Papers of Sir Andrew Mitchell, K. B., Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary from the court of Great Britain to the court of Prussia, from 1756 to 1771*, Vol. 1 (London, 1850), p. 3.
[6] Gerald Newman, ed, *Britain in the Hanoverian age: An encyclopedia* (New York and London, 1997), p. 560.
[7] Patrick Francis Doran, *Andrew Mitchell and Anglo-Prussian diplomatic relations during the Seven Years War* (New York and London, 1986), pp. 4-5. A note on Mitchell's life in the papers of Mitchell's friend and colleague James Harris, first earl of Malmesbury, states that Mitchell and his wife had two children, both of whom died young, but there is no further evidence for a second child. See Malmesbury Papers, Hampshire Records Office, 9M73/G2347, f. 16.
[8] M. A. Stewart and P. Wood, 'Introduction', in George Turnbull, *Education for life: Correspondence and writings on religion and practical philosophy*, ed. M. A. Stewart and Paul Wood (Indianapolis, 2014), pp. xvii-xviii.

impact of their teachings on students. Moreover, Turnbull espoused a more contemporary agenda of reading that embraced Locke and Newton, and sought to apply a Newtonian approach to moral philosophy that aligned with that author's natural philosophy approaches,[9] and indeed somewhat united the two.[10] Most importantly, Turnbull, like Mackie, brought his understanding of history to the present, for only there could it be made useful to 'teach moral and political lessons'.[11] These teachings impacted Mitchell in several ways: it inculcated in him a strong sceptical approach to intellectual authorities; it created in him an ability to debate on the most topical publications and ideas of the day, drawing from ancient and modern authors; and it gave him a specific political and historical outlook that had a strong impact on the way in which his political career would progress, certainly at least in the early years before the circumstances of contemporary politics changed.[12]

Mitchell's classes in the newly formed 'Universal History' curriculum taught at Edinburgh were to be informed by Charles Mackie's enormous depth of research. Mackie, a tireless compiler of lists and publications, also distilled for his students valuable hierarchies of philosophers, ideas, and moments in history. From these, he derived a sense of insight that he was able to convey to his students. In the University of Edinburgh Library are Mackie's notebooks and lists, among which is his 'Dissertation on the vulgar errors in history and how to detect and rectify them'. This dissertation, read in 1741 before the Edinburgh Philosophical Society, brings together the earlier ideas Mackie held about how to examine history, to write it, and to judge its truth. According to his biographer Esther Mijers, Mackie taught that 'authentic sources, reason and logic ought to be the historians' sole tools'.[13] Mackie himself noted that historical enquiry demanded that the reader examine 'the weight and moment of its subject', its truth, and the method of its delivery.[14] In the same notebook, Mackie more explicitly wrote that the historian ought not to utilise any dubious authorities, present their evidence to the prejudice of anyone else's reputation, or say anything which does not stand up to close scrutiny.[15] One of the first things Mackie taught his students (including Mitchell) to do was to penetrate the veneer of the fabulous that some writers sought to draw

[9] Turnbull to Mackie, 23 October 1730, in *Ibid.*, p. xxi.
[10] Knud Haakonssen, 'Natural jurisprudence and the identity in the Scottish Enlightenment', in Ruth Savage, ed, *Philosophy and Religion in Enlightenment Britain* (Oxford, 2012), p. 267.
[11] Stewart and Wood, 'Introduction', p xxiii.
[12] Books on the subject of the Scottish Enlightenment which contribute to these areas in this thesis include Istvan Hont and Michael Ignatieff, eds, *Wealth and virtue: The shaping of political economy in the Scottish philosophy of the Scottish enlightenment* (Oxford, 1983); Paul Wood, ed, *The Scottish enlightenment: Essays in reinterpretation* (Rochester and Suffolk, 2000); Alexander Broadie, ed, *The Cambridge companion to the Scottish enlightenment* (Cambridge, 2003); Mijers, E., *'News from the Republick of Letters': Scottish students, Charles Mackie and the United Provinces, 1650-1750* (Leiden and Boston, 2012).
[13] Mijers, *'News from the Republick of Letters',* p. 170.
[14] Edinburgh University Library (EUL), Dc.5.24(2), Commonplace book of Charles Mackie, f. 117.
[15] *Ibid.*, f. 134.

before their readers.[16] It ingrained in his students that sagacity and scepticism of shows that Thomas Carlyle attributed to Mitchell.[17] Mitchell corresponded sporadically with Mackie for the remainder of Mackie's life.[18]

Turnbull's approach to learning was shaped by his 'Baconian belief in the unity of all branches of human knowledge'.[19] Turnbull was a travelling tutor as well as a university lecturer; his diverse interests allowed him to pursue his own interests as well as those of his companions. He certainly went to the Netherlands with Mitchell, as Mitchell's friend Patrick Murdoch gave compliments to them in a letter to Mitchell of 28 August 1729.[20] The training of Scottish lawyers at this time placed emphasis on theories of natural law that informed practice, and took note of recent books that linked trends in the growth of Scots law to natural law.[21] Turnbull told Mackie that he was in Utrecht in January 1730 taking a 'privatissumum upon Grotius in conjunction with Mitchel' when Mitchell had begun his Grand Tour there.[22] Although this can be seen as formative in some ways in the context of Mitchell's later diplomatic and political career, in fact many Scottish students took private classes upon Grotius at Utrecht and Leiden in this period – what were known as *Collegium Grotianum*[23] – due to the authority of Dutch professors.[24] In addition, Dutch professors inculcated a broad knowledge in their students, and encouraged them to branch out from their core interests, indicating a more rounded approach to the future careers of their scholars.[25] In short, as John W. Cairns has noted, these broader studies enabled young Scots to 'pursue other subjects potentially useful to them in their careers or which were considered useful acquisitions for a gentleman'.[26] Turnbull was still with Mitchell in June 1730,[27] and later noted Mitchell heading back to 'study Law at the Corpus another winter'.[28] Both Turnbull and Mackie's impact on Mitchell was to produce a young man adept at applying critical analysis of his society, and the people around him, to his own circumstances.

Liberal education, Turnbull argued, should 'cherish into proper vigour the love of liberty'.[29] Taking his cue from the classical authors, Turnbull argued that the shaping of a man capable of great actions was derived from 'such mastery over the appetites and inclinations as emboldens and enables one to resist the

---

[16] Mijers, *'News from the Republick of Letters'*, p. 168.
[17] Carlyle, *History of Friedrich II of Prussia*, vol. 5 (Boston, 1884), p. 309.
[18] See letters Mitchell to Mackie: Leiden, 17 April 1731, EUL La.II.91, f. 6.; London, 5 July 1737, EUL La.II.91, f. 7; London 12 November 1737, EUL La.II.91, f. 74; London 15 February 1752, EUL La.II.91, f. 22.
[19] Stewart and Wood, 'Introduction', pp. xxv-xxvi.
[20] Murdoch to Mitchell, 28 August 1729, BL Add. MS 58289, f. 1.
[21] John W. Cairns, 'Legal theory', in Broadie, ed, *The Cambridge companion to the Scottish Enlightenment*, pp. 222, 227-228.
[22] George Turnbull to Charles Mackie, 10 January 1730, EUL La.II.90, f. 74v.
[23] John W. Cairns, 'The first Edinburgh chair in law: Grotius and the Scottish Enlightenment', *Fundamina*, 11 (2005), p. 34.
[24] Edwin van de Haar, *Classical liberalism and international relations theory: Hume, Smith, Mises and Hayek* (New York, 2009), p. 73; Cairns, 'Legal theory', p. 227.
[25] Roger Emerson, *Essays on David Hume, medical men and the Scottish Enlightenment* (Farnham and Burlington, 2009), pp. 12-13.
[26] John W. Cairns, 'Legal study in Utrecht in the late 1740s: The education of Sir David Dalrymple, Lord Hailes', *Fundamina*, 8 (2002), p. 43.
[27] Mitchell to Mackie, 29 June 1730, EUL La.II.91, f. 5.
[28] Turnbull to Mackie, 23 October 1730, in Stewart and Wood, eds, *Education for life*, p. 24.
[29] Turnbull, *Observations*, p. 37.

importunity of present pleasure or pain for the sake of what reason approves'.[30] Though not explicitly acknowledged by Mitchell, there is no doubt that these views resonated with Mitchell's future behaviour and interests, not least his interest in the Stoicism of Roman authors such as Cicero and in his moderate political leanings. Moreover, as will be noted in Chapter 2, Cicero had emphasised a joy in the pursuit of knowledge, and Mitchell absorbed this as a way to understand the constant pursuit of improvement that dovetailed with a public career. His later and somewhat mysterious disagreements with Turnbull need not detract from these important impacts on Mitchell's early life.[31] Indeed, according to Karl Schweizer, Mitchell's education, and his later interest in moral philosophy and literature, reflects the changes in education and intellectual thought growing in Edinburgh during Mitchell's university life.[32]

While in 1727 Mitchell was articled to an advocate to continue his legal training,[33] he moved to London in 1729, and from there, as noted above, he embarked on a Grand Tour of Europe, travelling through France and Italy, and returning in 1735.[34] Upon his return Mitchell joined numerous learned and literary societies (explored later in this thesis) and studied for the English bar. In 1741 he was appointed the personal secretary to John Hay, 4th Marquis of Tweeddale, and in 1742, when the latter was appointed as Secretary of State for Scotland, he took Mitchell as his Undersecretary, positions they both held until their abolition in January 1746 following the 1745 Jacobite Rebellion. Mitchell then came under the political patronage of the Pelhams – Henry Pelham and his brother Thomas Pelham-Holles, Duke of Newcastle – and was elected to parliament as an MP for Aberdeenshire in place of his old friend Sir Arthur Forbes. In 1753 he lost his seat on account of his poor relationship with the controller of Scottish patronage, the 3rd Duke of Argyll, but was elected for Elgin Burghs in 1754, a seat he held until his death in 1771.

In 1752 Mitchell was appointed as one of the British Commissioners to the re-negotiations of the 1715 Barrier Treaty between Britain, Austria, and the Dutch Republic, and he was sporadically in The Hague from 1752-1755 until negotiations failed.[35] Proposed for a political position in Scotland, Mitchell was then put forward as a possible British Ambassador to Austria. When this did not eventuate Mitchell was sent as Britain's representative to Prussia, where he arrived on 8 May 1756.[36] The Diplomatic

---

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 45.
[31] In letters in the British Library Turnbull writes Mitchell asking for a formal reconciliation, to which Mitchell replied that he could do Turnbull a service but could not at that time reconcile. No information is given as to the reason of their disagreements except a vague reference to 'weak & childish' behaviour. See George Turnbull to Mitchell, undated, BL Add. MS 58291, f. 139; Mitchell to Turnbull, draft, BL Add. MS 58291, f. 140.
[32] Karl W. Schweizer, 'The Early Years of Sir Andrew Mitchell (1708-1771): A Biographical Addendum', *Scottish Tradition*, 15 (1989), p. 51.
[33] This remainder of this paragraph drawn from the above sources, as well as Mitchell's entries at the *History of Parliament Online*. See Edith Lady Haden-Guest, 'Mitchell, Andrew (1708-1771), of Thainston, Aberdeen', at http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1715-1754/member/mitchell-andrew-1708-71, accessed 22 August 2018; and Edith Lady Haden-Guest, 'Mitchell, Andrew (1708-1771), of Thainston, Aberdeen', at http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1754-1790/member/mitchell-andrew-1708-71, accessed 22 August 2018.
[34] Schweizer, 'The early years of Sir Andrew Mitchell', pp. 51-54.
[35] British Library (BL) Additional (Add) MS 58283 contains letters detailing these negotiations between 1752 and 1754.
[36] Mitchell to Robert Darcy, 4th earl of Holdernesse (hereafter Holdernesse), 14 May 1756, BL Add MS 58284, f. 7.

Revolution – which reversed the traditional alliance system of Europe – closely preceded the outbreak of the Seven Years' War, and it was here that Mitchell followed Prussia's king, Frederick II, on campaign for four years, before seeing out the remainder of the war from the safety of various Prussian towns and cities. Officially recalled to Britain in 1764 – a move precipitated both by Mitchell's ill-health and the dramatic decline in Anglo-Prussian relations – Mitchell served in parliament, met with friends, and recovered his health until being offered a return to Prussia in 1765. Following negotiations about rank, title and pay, and being given a knighthood as a member of the Order of the Bath, Mitchell set out for, and returned to Prussia in 1766. He carried out his diplomatic duties with diligence and care, having lost some of the close connection he had previously enjoyed with Frederick, and died in 28 January 1771 of pleurisy.[37]

ii. Existing literature on Andrew Mitchell

Andrew Mitchell has been included in many historical surveys of eighteenth-century British politics and diplomacy, but has only been the focus of study in two publications. An attempt was made early in the nineteenth century to bring Mitchell's papers together but the publication was never completed.[38] The letters in the possession of Sir William Forbes, the descendant of Mitchell's heir Sir Arthur Forbes, were offered for sale to the nation through the records commission in 1808.[39] Forbes used as his agent the Methodist minister and noted scholar Adam Clarke.[40] At that time, the speaker of the House of Commons declined to purchase them, but suggested Clarke contact the trustees of the Cottonian library at the British Museum. They were accordingly purchased for £400 on 19 April 1810, but were sealed for thirty years, as appears to have been custom, to prevent any public scandal arising from the contents of the papers.[41]

The first publication on Mitchell was in 1850, when his distant relative, Andrew Bisset, compiled a two-volume collection of Mitchell's papers. Bisset was 'struck with … the bold, blunt, straightforward character of the man' which he found 'unexpected in a diplomatist'.[42] Bisset argued that Mitchell's papers 'furnish a narrative written on the spot, in camps and on battle-fields, of some of the most remarkable

---

[37] Haden-Guest, 'Mitchell, Andrew', at http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1754-1790/member/mitchell-andrew-1708-71, accessed 22 August 2018.

[38] Lord Glenbervie to Messrs Constable and Co., October 4, 1806, pp. 185-187; Glenbervie to Messrs Constable and Co., November 7, 1806. Constable and Co. also confirmed later that Glenbervie had agreed to be the editor of the project in an undated letter. See A. Constable and Co to Glenbervie, p. 189. Glenbervie handed back the materials in 1808 having decided he could not complete the work, see Glenbervie to A. Constable, 10 July 1808, pp. 190-191. All these letters contained in Thomas Constable, ed, *Archibald Constable and his Literary Correspondents: A Memorial, in three volumes*, Vol. 2 (Edinburgh, 1873). The surviving manuscript collections that Glenbervie acquired or put together are seemingly the MSS 11260-1162, 1756-1770 at the British Library

[39] Rev. J. B. B. Clarke, ed, *An account of the religious and literary life of Adam Clarke, LL.D, F.A.S, etc. etc.*, Vol. 1 (New York, 1837), pp. 384-386; *The life and labours of Adam Clarke, LL.D.*, 2nd ed. (London, 1842), p. 148.

[40] Ian Sellers, 'Clarke, Adam (1762-1832)', *ODNB*, at https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/5483, accessed 22 August 2018.

[41] *Selection of Reports and Papers of the House of Commons*, Vol. 33, *Report from the Select Committee on the condition, management, and affairs of the British Museum; together with the minutes of evidence; appendix and index* (no place of publication, 1835), p. 423; *Life and labours*, p. 148.

[42] Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 1, p. vii.

military operations that have ever been performed upon the world's stage'.[43] Equally important, for Bisset, was Mitchell's proximity to Frederick II. As Mitchell often related Frederick's musings, thoughts and criticisms in his papers, Bisset believed Mitchell's papers could 'possess some portion of the interest and value which belong to dispatches written on the spot by one of the greatest commanders of ancient or modern times'.[44] A contemporaneous review of Bisset's publication of a selection of Mitchell's letters was scathing of the content and character of the publication. At that time, the review noted, readers were anxious for 'graphic pictures of the Court of Berlin drawn by one having the best opportunities for observation. We have been, however, to a great extent, disappointed'. The review continued:

> Sir Andrew Mitchell was a man of affairs in the part which he played, and in his style, which is extremely dry and brief. This correspondence is a long series of small notes rather than despatches, and none of the letters rise to the breadth and force of State papers. There is not that fulness of detail which is customary in the correspondence of our eminent diplomatists. The writer takes a clerk-like view of great subjects. His intellect was clear, but not commanding; and without being a mere formalist, his range of thought does not extend beyond that of an official red-tapist … we are astonished at the monotonous insipidity of the letters of Sir Andrew Mitchell.[45]

The review did, however, note that 'the authenticity constitutes the principal merit of the volumes under review'.[46] This appraisal that the value of Mitchell's papers lay in their ability to shed light on the character and operations of Frederick, and the state of British politics, remains true today.

In 1972, Patrick Francis Doran wrote his doctoral thesis on Mitchell and Anglo-Prussian relations.[47] While Doran's thesis contained some biographical information, and references to some of Mitchell's social, literary, and cultural activities, its primary aim was to shed light on the fine details of Anglo-Prussian relations at this crucial time in world history. Doran made a thorough examination of Mitchell's papers, and came to something of a character assessment of Mitchell that was in line with that expressed by Bisset, and by the eminent historian Thomas Carlyle (see quotation at the beginning of this chapter). In his entry for Mitchell in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, historian Hamish Scott also recognises the central elements of Mitchell's character, being that 'bluff, straightforward' nature.[48] Sizeable

[43] *Ibid.*, p. viii.
[44] *Ibid.*
[45] *The Athenaeum*, June 29, 1850, no. 1183, in *The Athenaeum Journal of literature, science, and the fine arts. For the year 1850* (London, 1850), p. 677.
[46] *Ibid.*
[47] Doran, *Andrew Mitchell.*
[48] Scott, 'Mitchell, Andrew', *ODNB.*

portions of Doran's thesis omit reference to Mitchell entirely, and while this was at times done out of necessity and due to the focus on diplomacy, it thereby neglected important areas of Mitchell's life and career which have strong implications for how we understand his life and career. Doran did note the importance of Mitchell's personal conduct in the maintenance of effective diplomatic relations: 'more important were the personal qualities Mitchell brought to the task. These enabled him to establish – and maintain – that harmonious relationship with Frederick which resulted in the smooth working of Anglo-Prussian relations during the greater part of the war'.[49] Doran also noted the aspects of Mitchell's character that would have won him favour and interest from Frederick, such as their mutual friends, and Mitchell's literary and intellectual expertise.[50] Doran's study only covered the period 1755 to 1763. There is thus a fuller picture to be painted of Mitchell's political career and formative years, which furnish a new perspective of the aims and effectiveness of his later diplomacy.

These two works by Bisset and Doran are the only publications with Andrew Mitchell as their focus. In addition, Mitchell has been mentioned in works spanning the many facets of his career and interests: British politics, literature, science, philosophy, learned societies, and of course, foreign relations and diplomacy. A fresh examination of his career is needed, however, which analyses both his diplomatic and cultural activities in light of recent scholarship on the 'new diplomatic history'.

iii. Works of diplomatic and 'new' diplomatic history

Historians of diplomacy are increasingly interested in the cultural aspects of conducting diplomacy in the eighteenth century. This is known as 'new diplomatic history'. Diplomatic history, as Hamish Scott has noted, has traditionally been understood to examine the political operations of diplomats.[51] In terms of British diplomats, their papers have been utilised to a large degree to inform the examinations on the state of British politics, particularly as the shambolic politics of mid-century and its personalities have a high degree of magnetism for scholars. Yet it is also symptomatic of this field that overly focusing on one area has neglected others which are in great need of further work. Where William Pitt, for example, has been the subject of a handful of full-length works in the last sixty or so years, one of the greatest foreign ministers, politicians and patrons of the age, the Duke of Newcastle, has been the subject of only two full-length books, published in 1974 and 1975 respectively.[52]

---

[49] Doran, *Andrew Mitchell*, p. 2.
[50] *Ibid.*, p. 3.
[51] See footnote 2 of this chapter.
[52] O. A. Sherrard, *Lord Chatham: A war minister in the making* (London, 1952) and *Lord Chatham: Pitt and the Seven Years War* (London, 1955); Stanley Ayling, *The elder Pitt, Earl of Chatham* (New York, 1976); Jeremy Black, *Pitt the elder* (Cambridge, 1992); Karl W. Schweizer, *William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, 1708-1778: A bibliography* (Westport, 1993); Marie Peters, *The elder Pitt* (Harlow, 1998); Edward Pearce, *Pitt the elder: Man of war* (London, 2010). For Newcastle, see Ray A. Kelch, *Newcastle: A Duke without money: Thomas Pelham-Holles 1693-1768* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1974); Reed Browning, *The Duke of Newcastle* (New Haven, 1975).

Diplomatic history and the history of international relations have a serious and ongoing role to play in the emergence of 'new' diplomatic history. Without important modern works on the eighteenth century by such scholars as Jeremy Black and Hamish Scott, we could not know as much as we now do about the intricacies of diplomacy and its role in the political landscape of eighteenth-century Britain and Europe. Karl W. Schweizer has also contributed enormously to our understanding of the relationship between British domestic politics and its foreign relations in the middle of the century.[53] Black's many publications bring definition to eighteenth-century British politics and its key figures has not only grown our knowledge of archival sources in this area, but also the ways in which we should use them. As Black noted in 1987, 'foreign policy is rarely perceived as a crucial problem of political management or debate', and in regard to traditional approaches to diplomatic history, Black noted that the field was not only bracketed to the point of precluding use in other fields, but that its exponents were also keen to favour the key men and events surrounding them, a trait it had inherited from earlier historians.[54] Exceptions to Black's criticism that historians have for too long neglected foreign archival and printed sources have been Hamish Scott and Tim Blanning, both of whom have written extensively on European political and cultural systems, and what they mean for interpretations and understandings of British policy and procedure in this period.[55]

Black called for historians to engage with sources outside Britain, as well as sources in languages other than English. To some extent, that call has been heeded of late, particularly in the work of Jennifer Mori. Mori herself recognised the lineage of 'new diplomatic history' that originated with David Bayne Horn at the University of Edinburgh, and worked its way through to the work of Jeremy Black and herself. Horn worked through the field of British foreign policy and became especially interested in British diplomats of all spheres.[56] His key work which originated the study of the cultural activities of diplomats, and the challenges they faced other than negotiating with princes, was *The British Diplomatic Service, 1689-1789*, published in 1961.[57] A pupil of diplomatic historian Sir Richard Lodge, Horn was more interested in

---

[53] Karl W. Schweizer, 'Lord Bute, Newcastle, Prussia, and the Hague overtures: A re-examination', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 9 (1977), pp. 72-97; idem, with Carol S. Leonard, 'Britain, Prussia, Russia, and the Galitzin letter: A reassessment', *The Historical Journal,* 26 (1983), pp. 531-556; idem, ed, *Lord Bute: Essays in re-interpretation* (Leicester, 1988); idem, *England, Prussia and the Seven Years War* (Lewiston, Queenston and Lampeter, 1989); idem, *Frederick the Great, William Pitt, and Lord Bute: The Anglo-Prussian Alliance, 1756-1763* (New York and London, 1991).

[54] Jeremy Black, 'British foreign policy in the eighteenth century: A survey', *Journal of British Studies*, 26 (1987), pp. 26, 29-30

[55] For the criticism see Black, 'British foreign policy in the eighteenth century', pp. 26-27. Scott's most influential publications, and those that have assisted greatly in the formation of this study, include Hamish Scott, *British foreign policy in the age of the American Revolution* (Oxford, 1990); idem, 'Prussia's royal foreign minister: Frederick the Great and the administration of Prussian diplomacy', in Robert Oresko, G. C. Gibbs and H. M. Scott, eds, *Royal and republican sovereignty in early modern Europe: essays in memory of Ragnhild Hatton* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 500-526; idem, *The emergence of the eastern powers, 1756-1775* (Cambridge, 2001); idem, *The birth of a great power system 1740-1815* (Harlow, 2006). Tim Blanning's work has informed the cultural elements of this thesis, and his mastery of the life of Frederick the Great has been indispensable. See Tim Blanning, *The culture of power and the power of culture: Old regime Europe 1660-1789* (Oxford, 2002); idem, *Frederick the Great: King of Prussia* (London, 2015).

[56] D. B. Horn, *Sir Charles Hanbury Williams and European diplomacy, 1748-1759* (London, 1930); idem, *British diplomatic representatives 1689-1789* (London, 1932); idem, 'Scottish diplomatists 1689-1789', *Historical Association Publications* (1944), pp. 3-18.

[57] D. B. Horn, *The British diplomatic service, 1689-1789* (Oxford, 1961).

the workings of a diplomat's day-to-day life, training, pay, and ambitions, rather than, as Black has argued, Lodge's 'aggressively diplomatic' work, in which 'foreign policy was the prerogative of a small group, and domestic pressures on the formulation and conduct of foreign policy were substantially discounted'.[58] Horn's work changed this, focusing more narrowly on the personal challenges facing diplomats and those who ran the service. It showed the sinews of the diplomatic service which was often hidden behind considerations of power politics.

Jeremy Black's *British diplomats and diplomacy*, published in 2001, and *A history of diplomacy*, published in 2010, showed the sensitivities to motivations and problems facing diplomats and their employers at home and abroad that he had found wanting in Lodge's work. In the former work, Black explicitly acknowledged the lack of interest in the lives of diplomats that had prevailed in diplomatic history since D. B. Horn. Black argued that in order to understand the 'capabilities' and operation of Britain's foreign policy in the eighteenth century, understanding 'the nature of the British diplomatic service is seen as a valuable approach to this problem'. Black was also acutely aware that diplomats served many purposes besides negotiators, and noted such ideas as the diplomat's role in the emerging information societies of the eighteenth century,[59] and we see this through this thesis in Andrew Mitchell's work. More importantly, Black noted that from around 1750, British diplomats became much more central to their kingdom's conduct of foreign policy, particularly as personal royal or noble participation in diplomacy at foreign courts diminished.[60] Thus, the diplomat's individual skills not only in comprehending the will of the British ministry, but also in tailoring his conduct to the court to which he was posted, were of paramount importance. Black's *A history of diplomacy* supports this idea that diplomats were key to shaping policy at home through the collection and supply of information, which alone demonstrates more than a traditional understanding of diplomats as negotiators.[61] Thinking more broadly about diplomats, Black argued that 'diplomacy should be located not only in terms of developments in international relations but also of those in cultural representation and intellectual thought'.[62] As Karina Urbach has noted, diplomatic historians now embrace 'new methods for their work by amalgamating cultural, semiotic, and anthropological ideas as well as by going global through multiarchival research'.[63] Moreover, it is essential that in acknowledging what diplomacy can be, I also define the confines of this study with reference to further modern scholarship. Paul Sharp has argued that 'diplomacy' can imply statecraft, international relations, foreign policy, the conduct of international affairs, and simply also 'conducting human relations' using 'intelligence and tact'. However, Sharp also notes the pitfalls of misunderstanding the work of diplomats, the greatest of which is 'wrongheadedness about what

[58] Black, 'British foreign policy in the eighteenth century', p. 28. Examples include Richard Lodge, 'An episode in Anglo-Russian relations during the War of the Austrian Succession', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 9 (1926), pp. 63-83; idem, 'Presidential address: The mission of Henry Legge to Berlin, 1748', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 14 (1931), pp. 1-38.
[59] Jeremy Black, *British diplomats and diplomacy* (Exeter, 2001), pp. 11, 118.
[60] *Ibid.*, pp. 146-147, 154.
[61] Jeremy Black, *A history of diplomacy* (London, 2010), p. 86.
[62] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
[63] Karina Urbach, 'Diplomatic history since the cultural turn', *The Historical Journal,* 46 (2003), p. 991.

is and what is not diplomacy [which] will lead to a systematic depreciation of the work of diplomats, together with the resources and the conditions they need in order to function effectively'.[64]

Diplomatic history has indeed undergone a strong transformation from its past as a study of political forces at home and abroad. Last century, Herbert Butterfield observed that diplomatic history 'needs to be creatively reconsidered in terms of its enduring attributes and utility'.[65] The field has still not regained its standing of previous centuries, but the work of scholars such as Black and Mori have been a corrective to this in terms of applying cultural investigations to the lives and actions of diplomats. Mori noted that diplomacy should not be seen as a 'glamorous' profession, adding that diplomacy's 'social and cultural dimensions in this period have been neglected by scholars or, insofar as they have been investigated, have remained separate as a body of literature from political work on international relations'.[66] Mori identified the two fields as she saw them in the study of diplomatic history today: the traditional competition of 'national interests'; and 'self-fashioning in international politics, many dealing with issues of gender and scandal'. Mori carefully identifies her work as belonging more to the latter, in terms of the British abroad and their construction of an identity.[67] Finally, the rationale for the present study is further supported by the contention of Mori that many diplomatic papers explored in recent decades are still being utilised for their implications for state politics, rather than 'the meanings of diplomacy as a lifestyle and occupational identity'.[68]

iv. Scope of the thesis

Richard Maber recently noted that 'connections between the networks of scholarship and diplomacy have generally been taken for granted, with broad-brush generalisations extrapolated from a few well-known individuals who were distinguished in both fields'.[69] The aim of this thesis is to correct this by contributing original research on Andrew Mitchell as a diplomat who utilised his cultured background and intellectual interests to further his diplomatic mission. The key question that motivated this thesis is: how does 'new diplomatic history' help to interpret Andrew Mitchell's diplomacy in Berlin? The answer, in short, is that 'new diplomatic history' provides the tools to interpret diplomatic actions from a cultural rather than a purely political standpoint.

As outlined above, investigations of Britain's relationship with Frederick II and Prussia have been conducted primarily from the standpoint of Frederick's personality and political interests, alongside the

---

[64] Paul Sharp, 'Herbert Butterfield, the English School and the civilising virtues of diplomacy', *International Affairs*, 79 (2003), pp. 857-858.
[65] Jeremy Black and Karl W. Schweizer, 'The value of diplomatic history: A case study in the historical thought of Herbert Butterfield', *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 17 (2006), p. 622.
[66] Jennifer Mori, *The culture of diplomacy: Britain in Europe, c. 1750-1830* (Manchester and New York, 2010), p. 1.
[67] *Ibid.*, pp. 2-3.
[68] *Ibid.*, p. 3.
[69] Richard Maber, '*Réseaux diplomatiques et République des lettres: les correspondants de Sir Joseph Williamson (1660-1680)*. Par Alexandre Tessier', *French Studies*, 70 (2016), pp. 432.

turbulent British ministries of the 1750s and 1760s. They have failed to account for Mitchell's personal diplomacy, which this thesis sees as so crucial to Britain's continuing relationship with Prussia into 1762, when it inevitably began to crumble. William Pitt, a long-time friend of Mitchell, was drawn to remark in 1758 that Mitchell was in fact too central to Britain's diplomatic relationship with Prussia. Angered by Mitchell's support for Frederick's calls for British troops in Germany, Pitt wrote to Newcastle:

> Andrew Mitchell is not a fool and therefore he must be something not fit to be the instrument of the present system of administration … in a word, if your Grace is not able to eradicate this lurking diffusive poison a little more out of the mass of Government, especially from the vitals, I think it better for us to have done. I do not intend for one that Andrew Mitchell shall carry me where I have resolved not to go.[70]

The quote says much about the proximity of Mitchell to Frederick's policy formulation at that crucial early stage of the Seven Years' War. While he was so angered by what he saw as Mitchell's improper conduct, Pitt acceded to this point in the middle of that year. It confirms Mitchell's astute observations of what was required to win the war, particularly as he had first-hand knowledge of the very real possibility that Prussia could be defeated and Britain left without allies in Europe. Already in early 1758 Mitchell was crucial to Frederick's relationship with Britain. This thesis notes that the Diplomatic Revolution, and the rapid coming together of Britain and Prussia that resulted from it, was fundamental in keeping the two kingdoms together. However, the question of whether it would have progressed so well if another diplomat had taken Mitchell's place is a very different one.

One of the key themes of the thesis is the idea of friendship. Deeply ingrained in our concepts of sociability, politeness, and masculine libertinism, the idea of friendship still requires further scholarly attention. As Martin Kagel has argued, friendship in the eighteenth century served several important purposes. First, 'friendships among men were instrumental in creating networks of intellectuals'; secondly, a 'social heterogeneity' developed in the eighteenth century which made structures of 'profession, function, or status' weaker and more fluid; lastly, as Kagel argues, 'politically, male friendship circles anticipated a society of equals where members would be valued for who they were, not as representatives of rank or class'.[71] As Hannah Smith and Stephen Taylor note, friendship as a concept in early modern Europe was seen as 'conferring equality between both parties'. This helps to explain Mitchell's broad societal memberships and his interest in fraternal pursuits. However, as the authors note in their case study of John,

---

[70] 'Mitchell, Andrew (1708-71)', at https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1754-1790/member/mitchell-andrew-1708-71.

[71] Martin Kagel, 'Brothers or others: Male friendship in eighteenth-century Germany', *Colloquia Germanica*, 40 (2007), p. 213. For a more philosophical interrogation of Kant's understanding of eighteenth-century friendship, see Peter Fenves, 'Politics of friendship, once again', *Eighteenth-Century Studies* (1998/1999), pp. 133-155.

Lord Hervey's friendship with Prince Frederick in Britain in the first half of the eighteenth century, a relationship of a favourite to a prince could compromise friendship boundaries.[72] How then do we conceptualise Mitchell's relationship to Frederick? If, as Smith and Taylor argue, being the close friend of a prince raised one to 'a position above the rest of the prince's subjects to the potential detriment of princely authority', then surely Frederick would have recognised this.[73] To some extent, he kept his distance from Mitchell in the second half of Mitchell's tenure in Prussia. But in the earlier period, when Mitchell was so close with Frederick on the war campaign and when he would spend '5 or 6 days at Table, where only his Majesty was present',[74] it was not so easy to maintain a distance. As Smith and Taylor argue, 'like the rest of humanity, princes felt the desire for companionship. They acquired, loved and relied on friends. They wished to show them signs of favour, and such favour could not escape having a political dimension'.[75] This would support the contention of this thesis that Mitchell held what could be called a close working friendship with Frederick which also included bonding cultural elements.

To support the argument that Andrew Mitchell's personal form of cultural diplomacy was integral to his, and Britain's, relationship with Frederick, this thesis begins in Chapter 2 with an analysis of Mitchell's early years in Edinburgh and London. This serves two purposes: first, it adds valuable biographical information to our knowledge of Andrew Mitchell's life and career, which overlap in varying measures with British politics, Anglo-Scottish patronage, British sociability, and British learned gentlemen's societies. Chapter 2 thus builds on what is noted here: that Mitchell's intellectual interests and associations were crucial for his character and political formation. Mitchell's success at Frederick's court must be explained and does not stand alone as a spontaneous closeness between the two men. Chapter 2 argues that Mitchell's learned associations and pursuits enhanced his cosmopolitanism, but also his ability to grasp the fundamental aspects of success in what Peter Clark calls the 'associational world' of British clubs and societies.[76] It brings together previously unconnected strands of information on Mitchell's early commitments and friendships, and his involvement in societies such as the Society for the Encouragement of Learning, the Egyptian Club, the Society of Dilettanti, the Society of Antiquaries, and the Royal Society. Chapter 2 essentially establishes Andrew Mitchell's credentials as an intellectually active man, someone highly cultured but prudent, better equipped to face Frederick, and who contrasted significantly to his predecessor, Charles Hanbury Williams.

Chapter 3 focuses on Mitchell's political life in London from 1735 to 1756. As Chapter 2 provided the valuable context of Mitchell's social growth in London, Chapter 3 builds on this to examine the political sphere of the same period. In the same way that Chapter 2 interrogates how a young Scot could move

[72] Hannah Smith and Stephen Taylor, 'Hephaestion and Alexander: Lord Hervey, Frederick, Prince of Wales, and the royal favourite in England in the 1730s', *The English Historical Review*, 124 (2009), p. 231.
[73] *Ibid.*
[74] Mitchell to Holdernesse, 30 March 1760, BL Add MS 58285, f. 163.
[75] Smith and Taylor, 'Hephaestion and Alexander', p. 231.
[76] Peter Clark, *British clubs and societies 1580-1800: The origins of an associational world* (Oxford, 2000).

quickly into the spheres of social power in London, Chapter 3 interrogates the political side of the question and is very concerned to shed further light on Mitchell's place among the many Whig and Tory factions of eighteenth-century British political life (Part iii). Did his political affiliations affect his social advancement? What were Mitchell's approximate political affiliations? They have never been fully explored until now. This chapter sheds further light on the 'patriot' faction known for a time as the 'Boy Patriots', and which later was absorbed into the Pelham-Newcastle faction opposed to Ilay's interests (who in 1743 became 3rd duke of Argyll). It examines how Mitchell forged his political associations and how he was able to build a solid reputation and trustworthiness, and how he established lasting friendships – Andrew Millar, James Thomson, Patrick Murdoch, and George Lewis Scott were all in Mitchell's Scottish milieu – in an environment not altogether open to Scottish interests. In addition, it explores how he came to be in the sphere of the Duke of Newcastle's influence, and what this influence gave both Mitchell and Newcastle in terms of mutual benefit. In this, this part of the chapter is heavily informed by John Stuart Shaw's *The management of Scottish society 1707-1764: Power, nobles, lawyers, Edinburgh agents and English influences*.[77] This chapter is also concerned to show Mitchell's political rise in the office of Undersecretary of State for Scotland, and the accompanying exposure to patronage, interest, and the sinews of politics which this entailed. Furthermore, Chapter 3 investigates how Mitchell came to move into diplomacy, adds valuable insight to his diplomatic training, as well as placing him on a more continental scale of diplomacy. It explores the extent to which this diplomatic experience was valuable for Mitchell.

Chapter 4 is focused on Mitchell's use of cultural pursuits in his personal form of diplomacy, and is focused on the growth of his intellectual network between Berlin and London, as well as raising Mitchell's intellectual profile in Prussia, which was not at all the concern of his earlier biographers Andrew Bisset and Patrick Francis Doran. The question of why Mitchell cultivated knowledge and intellectual networks in Berlin is just as important as how he did it, and an analysis of its outcomes. Why did Mitchell succeed where others, such as Charles Hanbury Williams, had failed? What was it about Mitchell's conduct that placed him so close, personally and professionally, to Frederick? One of the suggestions put forward in this section is that Mitchell's early shows of loyalty earned him strong political credit. The other is that knowledge and intellectual pursuits were key to forging a strong relationship. Scholarship on the growth of the Enlightenment and the places and spaces of information transfer in eighteenth-century Europe has recently highlighted the role of contingency in the production of knowledge.[78] However, this chapter investigates

[77] John Stuart Shaw, *The management of Scottish society 1707-1764: Power, nobles, lawyers, Edinburgh agents and English influences* (Edinburgh, 1983).

[78] See for example Adi Ophir and Steven Shapin, 'The place of knowledge: A methodological survey', *Science in Context*, 4 (1991), pp. 3-22; Miles Ogborn and Charles W. J. Withers, 'Introduction: Georgian geographies?' in Miles Ogborn and Charles W. J. Withers, eds, *Georgian geographies: Essays on space, place and landscape in the eighteenth century* (Manchester and New York, 2004); Dorinda Outram, *Panorama of the enlightenment* (Los Angeles, 2006); Charles W. J. Withers, *Placing the enlightenment: Thinking geographically about the age of reason* (Chicago and London, 2007); Dorinda Outram, 'Placing the enlightenment: Thinking geographically about the age of reason by Charles W. J. Withers', *The Journal of Modern History*, 81 (2009), pp. 649-651; Dorinda Outram, *The enlightenment* (Cambridge, 2013); Charles W. J. Withers, 'Space, geography, and the global French enlightenment', in Daniel Brewer, ed, *The Cambridge companion to the French enlightenment* (Cambridge, 2014), pp. 214-232.

how Andrew Mitchell worked in knowledge production and knowledge networks from the rather isolated position of Prussia, where Mitchell was aided in the rapid growth of the intellectual side of his diplomatic mission to Prussia by the early presence of his friend, the clergyman and fellow intellectual Patrick Murdoch. Its specific purpose is to argue that Mitchell used a brand of cultural politics to strengthen Britain's relationship to Frederick and Prussia. Nevertheless, this was never isolated from the political circumstances, which changed almost weekly in the first half of 1756. The chapter begins with a brief account of the Diplomatic Revolution and its influence on Mitchell's arrival in Berlin in May 1756. It is impossible to sustain the key contention of this chapter – that Mitchell brought an intellectual connection to bear on his diplomatic relationship with Frederick – without acknowledging the uniquely isolated position of both Britain and Prussia in mid-1756. This is reinforced by key texts by Hamish Scott and Brendan Simms.[79] Mitchell's own papers, both published and unpublished, which are ever-present throughout this thesis, are also the most authoritative source on his thoughts and actions and led valuable insight into the minutiae of Frederick's thought.

The chapter utilises a large number of German language texts, heeding Jeremy Black's call for greater scholarship from foreign language sources in understanding the context of British foreign policy and diplomacy in this period.[80] Lastly, the chapter undertakes a sustained look at Mitchell's correspondence with the Scottish academic William Rouet, with whom he maintained a scholarly and personal friendship. Their correspondence covered patronage, diplomacy, and intellectual matters, and is highly representative of Mitchell's correspondence in general.

Chapter 5 is a sustained analysis of the intellectual side of Mitchell's diplomacy and interests, which along with Chapter 6 and its analysis of his original contributions to Anglo-Prussian literary links, forms a central, original contribution of this thesis. Chapter 5 builds on those formative elements explored earlier in the thesis, as Mitchell did not spontaneously become interested in the uses of science, but rather had a long association with its promotion. In Prussia, this interest was sustained, but became a crucial link in his diplomacy. As I explored his link to the Berlin Academy of Sciences in Chapter 4, Chapter 5 then makes a strong case for Mitchell's scientific interests making him a central figure of importance for Britons looking toward scientific exchange with Prussia. Crucially, Chapter 5 begins by defining Mitchell as what Anne Goldgar has termed an 'intermediary' in the Republic of Letters – someone who contributed to the production and circulation of new knowledge without being a producer of knowledge themselves.[81] This concept is woven throughout the chapter, with the aim of defining the very question, 'what did it mean to

[79] Some of these texts are cited in note 27 above. See also H. M. Scott, "The true principles of the Revolution': The Duke of Newcastle and the idea of the old system', in Jeremy Black, ed, *Knights errant and true Englishmen: British foreign policy, 1660-1800* (Edinburgh, 1989); Brendan Simms, *Three victories and a defeat: The rise and fall of the first British empire, 1714-1783* (New York, 2007).
[80] See note 27 above.
[81] Anne Goldgar, *Impolite learning: Conduct and community in the Republic of Letters, 1680-1750* (New Haven and London, 1995).

be an intermediary, and why does Andrew Mitchell fit this categorisation so well? It argues that Mitchell held no prevailing ideologies or allegiances in the Republic of Letters, but rather that his involvement was contingent on his ability and willingness to participate, both of which are evident.

In a more diplomatic vein, this chapter also makes further original contributions to knowledge by examining the papers held by the Burnett family of Kemnay, descendants of Mitchell's Berlin secretary, the Scot Alexander Burnet. These papers, previously only utilised by Jennifer Mori, are now further examined for Mitchell's comments of a scientific nature, which relate to his diplomatic mission in Prussia. They contain valuable written and anecdotal evidence to suggest Mitchell held science, with its own innate local and continental politics, to be an invaluable addition to the conduct of his diplomacy. How Euler fell out with Frederick II, for example, is seen by Mitchell in strong political terms at the conclusion of Part IV of Chapter 5. From this, Part V of Chapter 5, an examination of science in 'the honour of the Nation', argues that, while science did not always proceed upon national lines, it was certainly a realm in which Mitchell saw a more cosmopolitan, international network of ideas as being for the greater benefit of mankind than any competitive scientific protectionism. The chapter concludes with Part VI, bringing these strands of scientific research between Britain and Prussia back together to suggest that Mitchell, through numerous examples of scientific promotion and facilitation, held science as being of benefit both to the state and the individual, with no exclusivity.

Chapter 6 suggests that Mitchell promoted literature – specifically, Frederick's awareness of German literature – as a diplomatic tool to help further disentangle Frederick from France and to orientate him toward the emerging literary vibrancy of his own people. It is a key element in the main contention of this thesis that Mitchell's diplomacy was predominantly a cultural diplomacy. Questions explored on a literal and conceptual scale include: What literature and literary connections did Mitchell facilitate, and why? What was Frederick's view of this facilitation, if he held one at all? What implications did this have for German literature in a direct sense, and did it have any lingering effect? How important was Mitchell's literary background to his success in Prussia? What did he do to grow his reputation in this field, and to use it for cultural diplomacy? First the chapter establishes Mitchell's literary credentials as they stood at in the 1750s. Mitchell came to Prussia, as the chronicler of the Prussian court Dieudonné Thiébault noted, as the friend of the author of *l'Esprit des lois*, Montesquieu. Thus, his literary reputation preceded him. Given the interest in David Hume in Prussia and Germany more generally, this chapter examines Mitchell's familiar relationship with Hume, which extends from their time at Edinburgh University in the 1720s, right up until Mitchell's death. How familiar was Mitchell with Hume on a personal level? Did Mitchell use Hume for cultural credit in Prussia? This chapter examines their familiar relationship which has been largely ignored in previous separate scholarship on the two of them. Recently, historian Adam Budd has noted evidence for their relationship being a more familiar one than Hume scholars Ernest Campbell Mossner and J. Y. T.

Greig might have noticed.[82] So for Mitchell to write to Hume that 'as the hart thirsteth after the water brook, so have I for a letter from you', is a prompt that required the insight dedicated to it in this part of Chapter 6. Building on this, I quote excerpts and entire letters from Mitchell to Hume which have not been quoted in this context before. I add new interpretive evidence to previous examinations of Mitchell's ownership of Hume's extremely rare (and considered by him to be potentially explosive) dissertations on suicide and the immortality of the soul.[83] Chapter 6 then explores the interlinking literary and cultural episodes involving Frederick and Mitchell, which further establish Mitchell's literary credentials. Part IV of Chapter 6 takes stock of the state of German literature in the middle of the century, and the key contribution of the chapter is an analysis of Frederick's meetings with German authors, such as that with Christian Fürchtegott Gellert so carefully arranged by Mitchell, in Leipzig in the winter of 1760-1761. Here, Tim Blanning's valuable arguments of the power of culture are brought to bear on interpreting the evidence of Mitchell's contributions before us.[84]

Chapter 7 takes us beyond the work of Bisset and Doran once more. Both concluded their examinations of Mitchell's career and political contributions at 1763. Although Bisset included some evidence of Mitchell's criticisms of Frederick after the war and up until Mitchell's death in 1771, there is a relative lack of interest as compared to the correspondence of the war years. The chapter is entitled 'The limits of diplomacy', and takes as its fundamental argument the point that cultural diplomacy could only go so far in the pragmatic world of European politics. How far could cultural diplomacy take Mitchell? Chapter 7 thus is focused on establishing Mitchell's attitudes post-1763, and the environment in which he worked. It encompasses a good deal of time, up until his death in 1771, and follows him from Prussia, back to Britain between 1764 and 1766, and back to Prussia again. The chapter utilises Mitchell's letters to Burnet, preserved at Kemnay in Scotland, to establish further his thinking about Frederick and his own career, as well as its future prospects. Mitchell wrote a number of strong criticisms of Frederick's post-war policies.[85] Yet if Mitchell was robbed of some of the key elements of his power – Britain's subsidy of Prussia's war effort, and Frederick's amenability to cultural influences – then there must be some further context for the subsequent criticisms of Frederick written by Mitchell. In the context of investigating the crumbling of the cultural edifice, I ask, most importantly, what role did Mitchell play in the events of the first half of 1762, which effectively realigned the balance of European diplomacy once more? One of the key explorations is that of the 'Galitzin letter' of 1762, and the fallout from this. It has been comprehensively explored by Karl Schweizer,[86] and here, my primary question is whether, and to what extent, Frederick implicated Mitchell

[82] Adam Budd, 'Men of consequence: Whimsical David Hume, politician and man of business: an unpublished letter', *TLS*, 23 January 2015.
[83] For previous examinations on this area, see Ernest Campbell Mossner, 'Hume's 'Four Dissertations': An essay in biography and bibliography', *Modern Philology,* 48 (1950), pp. 37-57. A full explanation by Hume can also be found in David Hume, *A Dissertation on the Passions. The Natural History of Religion: A critical edition*, ed. Tom L. Beauchamp (Oxford, 2007), pp. xxii-xxiv.
[84] Blanning, *The culture of power and the power of culture*, p. 550.
[85] See for example Mitchell to Macartney, 7 October 1766, in Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, pp. 367-368, where Mitchell notes Frederick's 'avarice'.
[86] See above note 25.

in what he saw as the British ministry's double-dealing or even betrayal of him in their negotiations with other powers. I argue that Frederick retained a fondness for Mitchell after the collapse of Britain's relationship with Prussia, and while he did not blame Mitchell for the ministry's actions – he continued to see Mitchell as 'virtuous'[87] – Frederick's pre-occupation with his safety vis-à-vis Russia, and the rebuilding of his finances and infrastructure, led him to care less about Mitchell and Britain. The thesis will then conclude with Chapter 8, providing a thematic summary of Mitchell's career and diplomacy.

[87] Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, p. 160.

Chapter 2

'Has he not been as a father to us?': The role of patronage, sociability, and gentlemen's societies in Mitchell's early career

i. Introduction

In the introduction Mitchell's early life, influences, and formative years were outlined in order to bring to the fore those areas of his life that would show themselves as key themes in the subsequent decades. His intellectual pursuits only grew; his ability to form lasting and beneficial friendships with great and minor men alike allowed him to become one of the leading intellectual facilitators of his era. However, his career was built on more than friendships with influential people. Friendship in this period was built as much upon shared interests and pursuits as it was mutual assistance. To some degree, it cannot be doubted that circles of friendship mattered in terms of career advancement. For great patrons, this was often done in the form of favours. Mitchell participated in this system by patronising fellow Scots through membership and, on at least two occasions, leadership of learned societies that promoted the interests of a select social elite.[1] How exactly did Mitchell advance his career at this early stage? By what means did a young Scot in London engage in the types of social engagements that could advance his career? This chapter cites many of the occasions where Mitchell was able to advance his career by examining his membership of learned societies, the friendships formed there, and the mutual assistance Mitchell focused on in order to strengthen those bonds. It will be argued that, by maintaining these forms of friendships, Mitchell was perceived as an accountable and dependable figure who, while not flourishing in the literary world by his own pen, was highly-skilled in opening doors for others due to the way in which he conducted his friendships. It paints the picture of Mitchell's formative years and thus shows the elements of culture with which he engaged, and which have relevance for his later career.

ii. Forging learned associations

[1] Mitchell was a member of a number of learned societies but took a primary leadership role in the short-lived Egyptian Society (where he was Treasurer), and in the Royal Society, where he was for a time, a member of the council. This is explored later in this chapter.

The key areas in which Mitchell flourished for the majority of his career, and where he exerted his energies most, came through domestic affairs, through connections with eminent friends both in Scotland and London. While the focus of this thesis is on cultural elements of diplomacy, the bulk of Mitchell's 'career' – from when he returned from the Grand Tour to London in 1735, until his death in 1771 – was one centred on British politics and culture. It is thus important to explore these origins, not only to shed more light on his activities and contributions in various areas, but also to lay the foundation for the arguments that follow in Chapters 4-7. His strong friendships with the mathematician and academic Colin Maclaurin, and the poet James Thomson, are examples of his strong cultural and intellectual connections forged at home in this early period. Both had been long known to Mitchell, and indeed Maclaurin had particularly been acquainted with Mitchell's intellectual capacity since the latter's residence in Edinburgh. Maclaurin had been a co-founder of the Edinburgh intellectual group The Rankenian Club, described by David Hume's biographer as 'perhaps the strongest unofficial influence towards the cultivation of good English style, soundness of literary taste, and general freedom of thinking…' in Edinburgh at this time.[2]

Founded by 'the leading spirits' of the Edinburgh University – Principal William Wishart, Charles Mackie, John Stevenson, and Maclaurin among them – the academics' club welcomed only a handful of students in the first sixty years of its life. Alexander Boswell of Auchinleck (the father of James), and John Pringle, joined Mitchell in the small student cohort hand-picked to join the club.[3] The Rankenians debated the merits of contemporary metaphysics, philosophy, politics, and, of course, theology. Ernest Mossner attributes David Hume's literary passion and his love of Newton and Locke specifically to his time at Edinburgh, while the works of Shaftesbury, Locke, Mandeville, Hutcheson and Berkeley were also debated.[4] G. E. Davie places Hume, aged sixteen, in the midst of the Rankenian debates on the opposing philosophies of Francis Hutcheson and George Berkeley, debates which involved his old 'associates' Andrew Mitchell and James Thomson. Davie, moreover, asserts that it was from here that Hume established his own thoughts on Hutcheson and Berkeley, and that Rankenian debates formed the young Hume's ideas in a particular fashion on the principle of perception and understanding.[5] The contemporary, John Ramsay of Ochtertyre, wrote that the Edinburgh *literati* of the mid 1720s held 'metaphysical disquisitions', more fondly than theological or political debate.[6] Late member George Wallace eulogised the society more clearly. Not only was the Rankenian Club highly influential, but Scotland owed to it:

---

[2] Ernest Campbell Mossner, *The life of David Hume*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1980), p. 48.
[3] A full list of members as given by George Wallace, one of the last members prior to the club's dissolution in 1771, can be found in [Alexander Fraser Tytler of Woodhouselee], *Memoirs of the life and writings of the honourable Henry Home of Kames*, Vol. 1 (Edinburgh, 1807), Appendix 8, pp. 50-52. Mitchell is listed in the original 19 members.
[4] Mossner, *Life of David Hume*, p. 48. There is circumstantial evidence that Hume philosophised with the society, and that he read Berkeley at Edinburgh, since the university possessed some of Berkeley's books. Hume also professed, at this time, an aversion to everything but philosophy. See Philip P. Wiener, 'Communication: Did Hume ever read Berkeley?', *The Journal of Philosophy*, 58 (1961), pp. 327-328.
[5] G. E. Davie, 'Hume and the origins of the Common Sense School', in John Dunn and Ian Harris, eds, *Hume*, Vol. 1 (Cheltenham and Lyme, 1997), pp. 63-65. Originally printed in *Revue Internationale de Philosophie*, 6 (1952), pp. 213-221.
[6] Ian Simpson Ross, *Lord Kames and the Scotland of his day* (Oxford, 1972), p. 60

> freedom of thought, boldness of disquisition, liberality of sentiment, accuracy of reasoning, correctness of taste and attention to composition; and that the exalted rank which Scotsmen hold at present in the republic of letters, is greatly owing to the manner and spirit begun by that society.[7]

There was no doubt that the Edinburgh of Mitchell's late teens and early twenties was changing rapidly. The re-orientation of Scotland away from insularity with the defeat of the 1715 Jacobite Rebellion was in full-swing by the early 1720s when the Rankenian Club was founded. The elements of friendship which Mitchell later displayed in its early maturity with Montesquieu was evidently and irrefutably formed in these early experiences with learned Edinburgh gentlemen. The society's preoccupation with the latest writing from England and abroad demonstrated the swing in focus toward a more cosmopolitan learned world, and echoed the shift in Mitchell's own interests at the same time. The Rankenians, however, also showed that they were no mere flatterers of English taste, nor a disinterested group of men.[8] As an example, the Club's interest in the merits of George Berkeley's work – particularly his 1710 *Principles of Human Knowledge* – demonstrated not only a disinterest in literary ridicule, but a high degree of philosophical insight, and interest in empirical works, as well as works on morality and aesthetics.[9] According to a Scots Magazine article, the Rankenians 'accurately canvassed' Berkeley's writings, and maintained 'with that eminent and pious prelate … a literary correspondence, in which they pushed his singular tenets all the amazing length to which they have been carried in later publications'.[10] Berkeley was highly impressed with the club's penetration of his ideas, noting that nobody understood his work better than the Rankenians.[11] Although M. A. Stewart has rightly challenged the details of this account, there is no doubt a strong engagement between the club and this most un-Newtonian of philosophers,[12] for Berkeley appealed to the club as

---

[7] Roger L. Emerson, 'The Philosophical Society of Edinburgh, 1737-1747', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, 12 (1979), p. 184, n. 17. Emerson also lists here Mitchell's membership of the Philosophical Society of Edinburgh, of which Mitchell is listed on page 190.

[8] Emerson hints that the Rankenians were somewhat caught up in the ongoing student addresses at the University of Edinburgh in regard to the Rectorial elections, and the involvement of the Kirk. See Roger L. Emerson, *Academic patronage in the Scottish Enlightenment: Glasgow, Edinburgh and St Andrews universities* (Edinburgh, 2008), p. 69.

[9] Roger L. Emerson, 'Science and moral philosophy in the Scottish Enlightenment', in M. A. Stewart, ed, *Studies in the philosophy of the Scottish Enlightenment* (Oxford, 1990), p. 25.

[10] This correspondence has never been located. See Peter Walmsley, *The rhetoric of Berkeley's philosophy* (Cambridge, 1990), p. 44.

[11] G. Wallace, 'Memoirs of Dr Wallace of Edinburgh' *The Scots Magazine*, Vol. xxxiii, 1771, pp. 340-341. The article also notes Mitchell as a member and that Berkeley, in his excitement at the club's interest in him, offered them a role in his scheme to erect a college in Bermuda. The club politely declined.

[12] M. A. Stewart, 'Berkeley and the Rankenian Club', *Hermathena*, 139 (Winter 1985), pp. 25-45.

'professional philosophers and … those interested in what the general reader might reasonably regard as the minutiae of philosophy'.[13]

Mitchell acculturated to London life by expanding his social milieu. It was to be a theme of his career that he was capable of making friends quickly, and of demonstrating his strong character traits such as reliability, sagacity, and intellect. A regular circle of Millar, Thomson, Dr John Armstrong, and the clergyman Patrick Murdoch certainly enabled him to grow both his confidence and his network of friends.[14] The young Mitchell's estate was also well-endowed, and this would have removed an obstacle to his upholding the same standard of entertaining and social engagements as men who were his social superiors, the same men engaged in quickly spreading learned societies of all kinds. Having already shown himself adept at social networking on the Grand Tour, Mitchell sought to develop this skill further through discussion and intellectual debate, at dinners with friends, and in broader society.

During the early months of 1735, on his way back through Paris to London, Mitchell had entered the salon of Madame Claudine Guérin de Tencin through a personal invitation from his friend Montesquieu.[15] This was no ordinary practice, as few Englishmen had been admitted to Tencin's company and even those were drawn from the top of society: Bolingbroke had been closely associated with her prior to the establishment of her salon, as had the diplomat and poet Matthew Prior, and in the 1740s Chesterfield was admitted and highly admired.[16] Moreover, Tencin's salon became the most elite following the death of Madame Lambert in 1733, when her salonists migrated to the salon of Tencin.[17] It made Mitchell's arrival all the more timely. At Tencin's house, described as 'a receptacle for men of sense', Montesquieu introduced Mitchell to scientist Bernard le Bovier de Fontenelle, the economist Jean-François Melon, and the author Pierre de Marivaux. Others he met included Tencin's nephew the Marquis d'Argental, with whom he later had a three-way correspondence including Francesco Algarotti.[18] 'I had a good deal of friendship with M. de Montesquieu, and often enjoyed his company,' Mitchell wrote in his journal.[19] Tencin's salon opened Mitchell's eyes to a world of mutual intellectual friendship, of the pursuit of knowledge, of how it was

---

[13] John Valdimir Price, 'The reading of philosophical literature', in Isabel Rivers, ed, *Books and their readers in eighteenth-century England* (New York, 1982), p. 170.
[14] Alan Dugald McKillop, ed, *James Thomson (1700-1748): Letters and documents* (Lawrence, 1958), p. 202.
[15] Though Jean le Rond d'Alembert was Tencin's son, she had given him up to a foundling hospital. Given his trips to Tencin's salon, Mitchell either did not know their relation when he later mentioned d'Alembert in his letters from Prussia, or found it irrelevant.
[16] For Bolingbroke, Chesterfield, and Prior, see Chauncey Brewster Tinker, *The salon and English letters: Chapters on the interrelations of literature and society in the age of Johnson* (New York, 1915), pp. 42-47; for more on Bolingbroke, see Rex A. Barrell, *Bolingbroke and France* (Lanham, New York and London, 1988), pp. 7-8. It is possible that Chesterfield met a young Tencin in 1715, but there is no confirmation of this. See Rex A. Barrell, *Chesterfield et la France* (Paris, 1968), pp. 31-32 and also Samuel Shellabager, *Lord Chesterfield and his world* (New York, 1971), p. 78.
[17] Elise Goodman, *The portraits of Madame de Pompadour: Celebrating the femme savante* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 2000), p. 121.
[18] D'Argental to Mitchell, 8 June 1739, BL Add MS 58289, ff. 35-36. D'Argental later socialised with the Marquis d'Argens when the latter visited Paris and attended Tencin's salon in 1747, a neat intersection given that Mitchell would have so much to do with d'Argens when in Prussia from 1756 onwards. For more on d'Argental and d'Argens, see Julia Gasper, *The Marquis d'Argens: A philosophical life* (Lanham and Plymouth, 2014), pp. 162-163.
[19] Mitchell Grand Tour Diary, BL Add MS 58319, f. 106.

politely discussed and disseminated, and how this could be used for social advantage.[20] Tencin's salon has been seen as a form of disinterested friendship, particularly on the part of Tencin herself, to aid and assist her salon attendees.[21] At Tencin's salon, Mitchell wrote, 'one finds agreeable company that stand in no need of scandal and politics, the common topics of vulgar conversations'.[22] Perhaps he recognised the power of Tencin's salon to shape and make careers, or to give attendees a certain social power that could not be obtained otherwise.[23] This might explain the remarkable friendship he formed with Montesquieu, who continued to treasure Mitchell's friendship. When Mitchell wrote Montesquieu to introduce friends in 1738, Montesquieu replied lamenting the distance of Mitchell, missing the Scot and his 'belles qualités'.[24] As late as 1752, Montesquieu marvelled that his old friend Ottaviano Guasco could connect with Mitchell in Brussels during re-negotiations on the Barrier Treaty.[25]

Mitchell's ability to form strong and meaningful friendships flourished through the maintenance of friendships formed on the Grand Tour in the early 1730s and immediately after his move to London. His friendship with Montesquieu is one such example. Mitchell first encountered Montesquieu – already the famed author of the *Persian Letters* – in London in 1729. Coming to London on his tour of Europe, Montesquieu made a lengthy stay of two years. The French literary celebrity's entrée into London social life was guided by the earl of Chesterfield as host, who wasted no time introducing Montesquieu to his intimate circle of intellectual and influential friends.[26] Among the list which included the Dukes of Montagu and Richmond, Earl Granville, Charles Yorke (son of Lord Chancellor Hardwicke) and Martin Folkes, we find Andrew Mitchell. 'A singular man of vision' whom Montesquieu 'appears to have regarded almost with

---

[20] Mitchell's attendance at Tencin's salon is briefly noted in Doran, *Andrew Mitchell*, p. 3.

[21] One recent author has posited that Tencin's running of her salon accorded with a particular form of Epicureanism, in which the activities were a form of 'self-love' undertaken by all who attended. How this plays out in the sense of Mitchell's interest in Cicero and Stoicism is not elaborated by Mitchell, and perhaps he did not see the salon this way. See Michael Sonenscher, *Sans-culottes: An eighteenth-century emblem in the French Revolution* (Princeton, 2008), pp. 72-74.

[22] This account given by Mitchell in his Grand Tour Diary, BL Add MS 58319, f. 106. Sadly, Mitchell does not elaborate on the substance of their conversations, though some salonists themselves noted that the conversation could sometimes be somewhat artificial or even lacking a natural flow of ideas and exchange, possibly due to the dynamics of a salon environment with this particular group of people. See Arthur August Tilley, *Three French dramatists: Racine, Marivaux, Musset* (Cambridge, 1933), pp. 82-84; William H. Trapnell, *Eavesdropping in Marivaux* (Geneva, 1987), p. 7n3.

[23] Londa Schiebinger, *The mind has no sex? Women in the origins of modern science* (Cambridge, MA and London, 1989), pp. 31-32.

[24] Montesquieu to Mitchell, 11 August 1738, BL Add MS 58289, f. 25. For Mitchell's introductions to Montesquieu, see BL Add MS 58289, ff. 11^{r}-12^{r}, 22

[25] Montesquieu to Ottaviano Guasco, 27 June 1752, in Francois Gebelin and Andre Morize, eds, *Correspondance de Montesquieu*, 2 vols., Vol. 2 (Paris, 1914), p. 428.

[26] Chesterfield recounted to Sir Charles Hanbury Williams how, in those days, he was also acquainted with the 'consummate coxcomb' Francesco Algarotti, a 'led wit of the late Lord Hervey's'. Algarotti was a close friend of Mitchell and this will be explored later in the thesis. Henry Fox was also acquainted with Algarotti but said that, as he was always in Hervey's company, he was 'as a false light to a picture, his Lordship's affection mix'd so with and gave such a colour to all conversation that he join'd in.' For Chesterfield and Fox's letters, see The Earl of Ilchester and Mrs Langford-Brooke, *The life of Sir Charles Hanbury Williams: Poet, wit and diplomatist* (London, 1929), pp. 204, 207.

affection', Mitchell showed himself capable of offering himself to Montesquieu not only as a man of many important connections, but also a like-minded philosophical friend.[27]

For Mitchell, the real value in this correspondence was surely the friendship of Montesquieu himself, by now a member of the Académie Française and the Academy of Bordeaux. Montesquieu had cultivated friendships with other eminent Britons but also had an interest in the friendships of foreigners and, particularly, diplomats.[28] For Montesquieu, Mitchell's involvement in British intellectual life deepened the former's connection to Britain. In 1738 it enabled him to draw on Mitchell's connections in working to bring Alexander Stuart to Bordeaux, to accept their prize for his revised dissertation on musculature.[29] Stuart had led the formation of the Society for the Encouragement of Learning in 1736, of which Mitchell was also an early member, and which aimed to support genuine scholarly works by subscription, in answer to the damage done to this publication method by what were considered to be unscrupulous booksellers.[30] In addition, it enabled him to keep up connections with leading figures like Martin Folkes.[31]

The element of sharing, the passage of information, and mutual assistance in friendship was not new in the eighteenth century, nor in the much older Republic of Letters.[32] In Britain, the union of England and Scotland in 1707 precipitated a great leap forward for Scottish gentry. The union created a new impetus for ambitious Scots to make the move south. In the 1720s and 1730s a new wave of Scots, born in the eighteenth century, set themselves up in London as politicians, publishers, booksellers, or moneyed, landed gentry. By the time Andrew Mitchell settled in London in 1735, a milieu had already been created around his close friend, the bookseller and publisher Andrew Millar, who had established himself independent of his master James M'Euen in the Strand in January 1728.[33] Largely forged of his own industry, Millar's circle of authors and intellectual friends is best described as newly-settled Anglo-Scots, with a focus on an urban English gentleman's lifestyle and with the aim of integrating more fully into London social circles.[34] Mitchell was already friendly with a substantial number of the men into whose circle he now entered. That

---

[27] J. Churton Collins, *Voltaire, Montesquieu and Rousseau in England* (London, 1908, reprinted 1980), pp. 159, 174. The chronicler of life at Frederick the Great's Berlin Court, Dieudonné Thiébault, wrote how admirable Mitchell was, and gave as proof 'that he was united by the strictest bonds of friendship with the author of *L'esprit des Lois* [Montesquieu].' See Dieudonné Thiébault, *Original anecdotes of Frederick the Great, King of Prussia*, Vol. 2 (Philadelphia, 1806), p. 2.

[28] Robert Shackleton, *Montesquieu: A critical biography* (Oxford, 1961), pp. 174-175.

[29] Montesquieu to Mitchell, 11 August 1738, BL Add MS 58289, f. 25.

[30] As did his closest friend, the poet James Thomson, though Thomson's involvement was creative rather than financial. See Clayton Atto, 'The Society for the Encouragement of Learning,' *The Library*, Fourth Series, 19 (1938), pp. 263-288; Anita Guerrini, "A Scotsman on the make: The career of Alexander Stuart', in Wood, ed, *The Scottish Enlightenment*, pp. 157-176. Mitchell's membership of the Society for the Encouragement of Learning is asserted by Alan Dugald McKillop in his edited work *James Thomson,* p. 202.

[31] Montesquieu to Martin Folkes, 19 August 1738, in Gebelin and Morize, eds, *Correspondance*, Vol. 1, p. 334.

[32] Anne Goldgar has covered the end of the early era of the republic of letters, and the straddles the Enlightenment in her book *Impolite learning: Conduct and community in the Republic of Letters, 1680-1750* (New Haven and London, 1995).

[33] Millar had taken over his master James M'Euen's shop at the sign of Buchanan's Head. See Richard B. Sher, *The Enlightenment and the book: Scottish authors and their publishers in eighteenth-century Britain, Ireland & America* (Chicago and London, 2008), pp. 278-280.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 284.

engagement in British intellectual life which Montesquieu earlier prized was something in which Mitchell now fully engaged. From his early career, the transitions of Mitchell toward learned assistance, support and patronage were maintained by once more linking with Colin Maclaurin.

Of his former Rankenian associates it was Maclaurin with whom Mitchell had the strongest ongoing assistive friendship, and with whom he worked to bring Newton's work to the general public. Scotland for some learned men such as Hume and Robert Adams may have been 'narrow place',[35] but Maclaurin flourished in his academic role as Professor of Mathematics at Edinburgh, a post he obtained aged only 27. His friendship with Mitchell originates from this time, and their correspondence points not only to a mutual interest in learned subjects, but also a genuine care for one another's careers. It is clear that Maclaurin, besides his professorial income, had ongoing financial difficulties related to his venture in a farm outside Edinburgh.[36] His friendship with Mitchell does not hinge on this fact, but it no doubt increased the method and manner of Mitchell's actions.

Maclaurin worked tirelessly to bring his work on Newton's mathematics to public view. Maclaurin, like Mitchell, also sought social advancement and seems to have projected a future in the government service. When Mitchell returned to London from the Grand Tour in 1735, he immediately resumed his friendship with Maclaurin. The esteem in which Mitchell was still held in Edinburgh was obvious. Maclaurin reported that 'I have often heard such mention made of you by several persons of worth, since you left this, as one would wish always to hear of their friends'.[37] Mitchell confided to Maclaurin how the Grand Tour had changed his way of thinking, and his ambition. Mitchell had embraced the world around him, and Maclaurin encouraged him to 'take a year to try [your new way of thinking].'[38] In late 1741 or early 1742, Maclaurin made the trip to London and stayed with Mitchell, where they worked together to plan a path for Maclaurin's future. Their friendship, like many of Mitchell's friendships, was genuine but also productive. 'I am sure I learned by our little debates', he wrote Mitchell on the road back to Edinburgh, 'and I think it a great advantage to be criticised by one of whose friendship one is secure'. Maclaurin was more explicit in the same letter, acknowledging that Mitchell's interest in his future had helped him to shake off the rigours or writing and research:

> … a good deal of this is owing to your open friendly conversation. … My journey will do service to my health and this is owing to you. But none of these is equal to the sincere friendship you have long shown & I hope indeed ever will.[39]

---

[35] Roy Porter, *Enlightenment: Britain and the creation of the modern world* (London, 2000), pp. 242-243.
[36] For examples of his grappling with his tenant and the tenant's cabal, see Maclaurin to Mitchell, 3 May 1743, BL Add MS 6861, f. 51; Maclaurin to Mitchell, 24 May 1743, BL Add MS 6861, ff. 54^{r}-55^{r}.
[37] Maclaurin to Mitchell, 18 November 1735, in Bisset, *Memoirs*, Vol. 1, p. 7.
[38] *Ibid.*
[39] Maclaurin to Mitchell, dated Tuxford at 2.30pm, BL Add MS 6861, f. 35^{r}-36^{r}.

Mitchell thus showed an ongoing concern for his friend's success, security, and prosperity, but he was to also show this through the promotion in London of Maclaurin's academic work. G. E. Davie has explicitly named Mitchell as Maclaurin's 'literary executor'.[40] There was certainly a precedent for this among learned Scots, not only within the bounds of the Scottish intellectual communities and their universities, but also between those places and London. Richard Sher has shown the strong bonds between teachers and students that sprang from the Edinburgh university cohorts in the years prior to 1745, among whom Colin Maclaurin is a standout figure. Sher notes that mutual support for publications, and sometimes 'direct collaboration', were the products of these friendships. However, Sher shows the phenomenon as one of equals, or one of senior academics such as Maclaurin assisting their juniors.[41] In the case of Andrew Mitchell and Colin Maclaurin, this situation is uniquely reversed.

Mitchell enacted this reverse patronage through editing and collaborating with Maclaurin on the latter's *Treatise of Fluxions*, published in 1742. Mitchell's commitment to his friends was thus reinforced by a strong encouragement of their intellectual or cultural pursuits. In January of that year, shortly after he visited Mitchell in London, Maclaurin sent excerpts of his book to Mitchell, who in turn had proofed and edited the manuscript with Martin Folkes. To show his appreciation for their work and their intellect, Maclaurin ensured that Mitchell and Folkes became members of the Edinburgh Philosophical Society.[42] The publication of Maclaurin's *Treatise* only strengthened the mutual work being done for one another by he and Mitchell. Maclaurin communicated to Mitchell his concerns over the slow sales of the book, and the underpricing of it by booksellers, which he intended Mitchell to assist him with. Mitchell seems to have facilitated the publication of Maclaurin's work, and negotiated with booksellers.[43] At the same time, Mitchell sent Maclaurin the latest copies of the Royal Society's *Philosophical Transactions* in return for proof copies of Maclaurin's new work, *A Treatise of Algebra*, the introduction of which he showed to friends in London.[44]

There seems no doubt that Mitchell's advocacy and passion for Maclaurin's work transcended the beneficial arrangements Maclaurin pursued with other learned gentlemen. Mitchell worked not only for Maclaurin, but also those with whom Maclaurin corresponded. Robert Simson, Professor of Mathematics at Glasgow, told Maclaurin that he had sent his scientific opus *Sectionium conicarum libri V* (1735) to Mitchell

---

[40] Davie, 'Hume', p. 216.
[41] Sher, *Enlightenment*, pp. 132-136.
[42] Maclaurin to Mitchell, 6 January 1742, BL Add MS 6861, f. 37.
[43] Maclaurin to Martin Folkes, 26 January 1741/2, in Stella Mills, ed, *The collected letters of Colin Maclaurin* (Nantwich, 1982), pp. 370-372.
[44] These in several letters from 1743. For the proof copy of the *Algebra*, see BL Add MS 6861, f. 45 (undated though undoubtedly 1743); for Mitchell showing it to friends, see the same MS, Maclaurin to Mitchell, 27 December 1743, f. 70; for the slow sales and underpricing of his book, see the same MS, Maclaurin to Mitchell, 31 March 1743, f. 43; for the *Philosophical Transactions*, see the same MS, Maclaurin to Mitchell, 5 April 1743, ff. 47-48^{r}. The work on the *Algebra* had been slow going, as Maclaurin had written it in the 1720s for use in his classes, and only gradually worked on turning it into a book, published after his death.

and his friends in London, and Mitchell seems to have promoted the sale of Simson's work in London.[45] Mitchell continued his scientific advocacy in ernest, advising Maclaurin to send his latest theory on the shape and density of the earth to Martin Folkes.[46] The paper itself was deemed highly sensitive by Maclaurin. He authorised only three people to handle the paper, one of these being Mitchell, the other two being George Graham and James Jurin, also members of the Royal Society, men who 'are [Folkes's] particular friends in whom I have the greatest confidence'.[47]

Their mutual friend Patrick Murdoch, who was to edit and write the preface of Maclaurin's posthumous account of Isaac Newton's work, profited intellectually from Mitchell and Maclaurin's friendship. Murdoch, a trained Anglican clergyman and amateur mathematician, moved in Mitchell's Thomsonian circle (as will be shown below). Murdoch corresponded with Maclaurin on the contents of Maclaurin's work on the shape of the earth, and on Maclaurin's impending publication of *Treatise of Fluxions*. Murdoch informed Maclaurin that he had seen a part of the Treatise (not yet published) 'by the favour of Mr Mitchel [sic]', with 'all the world … impatient' for the publication. Its reputation had also gone continental, prior to its publication. Mitchell continued to handle and disseminate Maclaurin's works to Murdoch during 1741.[48] As for Mitchell himself, Murdoch is unequivocal: 'Mitchel … grows every day in the Esteem of all that know him'. Murdoch writes, informing Maclaurin also that Mitchell shall be the conduit for their correspondence and information transfer.[49]

The productivity of the Mitchell-Maclaurin friendship continued at least until the end of 1743, when a rise in Maclaurin's business concerning the production of maps of Northern Scotland and those proposed for a North passage consumed much of his time.[50] Though none of correspondence which may have passed between Mitchell and him in 1744 has been found, there is no doubt their correspondence continued, as Maclaurin requested from Mitchell 'the French pieces written by Madame de Chatelet & a piece by Gamaches for the Cartesian system, with a view to this work', in December 1743.[51] In 1745, Maclaurin led the defence of Edinburgh against the Jacobites, but was forced to flee, and upon returning to the city, fell ill and subsequently died in 1746. Thus 1743 represents the apogee of this friendship, a year in which scientific (see Part iii of this chapter) and literary works were frequently exchanged, strengthening

[45] Robert Simson to Maclaurin, 22 September 1736. The letter references in this paragraph are drawn from the correspondence importantly brought together in Mills, ed, *Collected Letters*. For this particular letter, see pp. 263-264.
[46] Maclaurin to Folkes, 2 March 1738/9, pp. 308-310, and Maclaurin to Folkes, 6 March 1738/9, pp. 310-313.
[47] Maclaurin to Folkes, 6 March 1738/9, pp. 310-313.
[48] Murdoch to Maclaurin, 8 June 1741, pp. 357-359.
[49] The cited information from Murdoch is found in Murdoch to Maclaurin, 23 March 1741, pp. 346-347. The letter is originally dated 1731, but the editor points out that this is impossible and must be a mistake, given the letter's contents.
[50] Colin Maclaurin, *An Account of Sir Isaac Newton's Philosophical Discoveries*, ed. P. Murdoch (London, 1748), p. ix. The bookseller and publisher Andrew Millar repeatedly requested Maclaurin's 'North Map', which the latter sent via Mitchell on 29 December 1743. See BL Add MS 6861, f. 72.
[51] BL Add MS 6861, 27 December 1743, f. 70.

their intellectual bond. In the interest of preserving their long and genuine friendship, there was ever-present in Maclaurin's mind Mitchell's welfare, his success, and the retention of his good character.[52]

This supportive patronage of Scots, but also his close English friends, was also evident in Mitchell's friendship with John Pringle. In the 1740s, Pringle, who was already a Professor of Pneumatics and Moral Philosophy at Edinburgh University, sought employment in the British army detachment serving on the continent. Pringle was ever keen to gain first hand experience in hospitals and in the field, and Mitchell had become his friend's patron, closely following his progress and constantly enabling Pringle to make further steps forward in his career and research. This ultimately led to his landmark publication *Observations on the Diseases of the Army in Camp and Garrison* (1752). Like Murdoch, Pringle saw Mitchell as a father figure, guiding his work, his thoughts, and his career in better and improving directions. Murdoch had extolled Mitchell's virtues, asking his friend John Forbes, 'has he not been as a father to us both? The same to McLaurin's family, to Thomson, and of late to Warrender; and to many others that we never heard of?'[53] From Ghent in 1742 Pringle had extolled the same virtues of care and attention that Mitchell possessed, and was conscious that he rambled as Pamela had done in Samuel Richardson's novel of the same name. These virtues Pringle praised correlate to some extent with the facilitator, or intermediary's, role of 'openness' and 'readiness & execution' that Pringle admired; in other ways, Mitchell goes well beyond the call of friendly duty. Pringle writes:

> Never had any man so good a friend as I in you & tho' I have been blessed with several none of them were comprehended all the qualities requisite so much as yourself, affection, sincerity, openness, advice, readiness & execution & if need be I know I may depend on your purse as well as other assistances I have had. My good fortune gives me not more pleasure than thinking it comes from you & I shall ever have as much pleasure in doing a good or wise thing through your advice as I am from my own judgement. I stand constantly so much in need of your help that my only concern is I may give trouble to you I wish the most pleasure to. I have sometimes thought my letters to you were like Pamela's to her father, fill'd with a number of triffles which none but a Father ought to hear.[54]

Pringle again professed similar supplication to Mitchell not one month later:

---

[52] Maclaurin to Mitchell, 25 October 1743, in Mills, ed, *Collected letters*, p. 392; See also Maclaurin to Archibald Campbell of Knockbuy, undated but believed to be March 1742, where he passes news of Mitchell's good situation at a state position (Undersecretary for Scotland) which would earn Mitchell £500 per year, in Mills, ed, *Collected letters*, pp. 454-455.
[53] Patrick Murdoch to John Forbes, 16 May 1754, *Culloden Papers*, p. 311.
[54] John Pringle to Andrew Mitchell, 15 December 1742, BL Add MS 6861, f. 178.

> I know how much it will give you pleasure (who have not only had a friendly but a sort of fatherly concern for me) to know how lucky I have been. I cannot help telling, however ominous it may be, that I have hitherto lived without the least quarrel or animosity with any person, & that every thing has succeeded far beyond my expectation.[55]

Pringle's confidence in Mitchell knew no bounds, and he was delighted to elaborate to Mitchell on his successes, discoveries, and ideas, which he ascribed as partly owing to Mitchell's uncommon assistance. At times he confessed an overwhelming nervousness, and conceded that he could never socialise or make powerful friends the way Mitchell could. In multiple letters Pringle self-deprecatingly castigates himself for his lack of masculine sociability. In the same letter in which he professed the success of his mission, he said 'whilst I was at Ghent I found the same effects of occupation you told me of when I was at London. I mean I almost forgot my sex'.[56] In a letter only weeks earlier, he had blamed not seeing anyone in the camp on not being able to 'shake off my academical tastes nor find engagement in any company, chusing that of a Woman I like a man I esteem & trust, & of one whose studys have been the same kind as my own'.[57] The ideas that eventually found their way into his 1752 *Observations* were elaborated in a series of letters to Mitchell between 1742 and 1744. We saw earlier how Pringle obsessed over his possible breakthroughs, living in a constant struggle between rest and work. He had written to Mitchell that he desperately wanted more military hospital experience.

> So strong is my taste this way that I now go to bed but with a grudge, nor lye in a moment after my fire is kindled in the morning: & I never go out with pleasure but to the hospital tho' otherwise the business there be abundantly fatiguing. Nothing ever was so much to any man's genius as an hospital to mine…[58]

Pringle told Mitchell that he 'flattered myself I may have a work usefull to the publick'.[59] Thus, in showing Mitchell's intimate understanding of Pringle's work, Mitchell emerges as a man deeply caring of both his friends but also the plight of fellow learned men and their families. Nothing could contrast Mitchell and

---

[55] John Pringle to Andrew Mitchell, 2 February 1743, BL Add MS 6861, f. 190^{v}.
[56] *Ibid.*, f. 191^{v}.
[57] John Pringle to Andrew Mitchell, 31 January 1743, BL Add MS 6861, f. 188.
[58] *Ibid.* In the same letter Pringle said he had been 'diligent in writing my observations on the Garrison Diseases about which I found every body here in a mistake as to their cause, ascribing them to fruit, drinking of gin & beer, & I know not what. I find the source of all the cold & moist Barracks; for in proportion to the moisture the sickness has always been greater or less'. See the letter cited here, f. 188^{v}.
[59] John Pringle to Andrew Mitchell, 2 February 1743, BL Add MS 6861, f. 191.

Pringle more in their sociability than their willingness to mould themselves to their company, making all at ease and increasing the potential for gainful social interactions. What shows this contrast most strikingly is Pringle's observation, noted earlier, that his lack of sociability harmed his career position and/or future prospects. Pringle reflected that he had not become intimate with many people as 'my acquaintance here is very general', adding, 'for partly my indispensable business & partly my consciousness of being the unfittest man of the world for any company making merry that is not of the kind of Robertson's Charles'.[60] This passing characterisation feeds into a greater eighteenth century conversation about manners and social graces, and what they meant for the world of sociability and power. As Neil Hargraves has shown, new and changing 'social conditions' meant the formulation of personality types, and their associated roles and understandings, were frequently updated. Considerations of character played a key role in conceptualising 'normative social roles'. Moreover, eighteenth century historical narratives, particularly in the work of the illustrious Edinburgh historian William Robertson, sought to seek and clarify the motivations of character that defined historical events. In this way much of human action could be linked to the individual strengths and weaknesses of character, something Pringle was only too aware of, and which he notably contrasted between his inferiority and Mitchell's superiority. When Pringle said that he was 'not of the kind of Robertson's Charles', he was saying that he was not able, as Robertson saw in Charles V, 'to combine a number of different *personae* and modulate them successfully'. The key then is Pringle's self-assessment that he was unable to 'maintain in harmony a succession of discrete characters', something that, as he recognised in Robertson's work, exposed a character as strong or weak, sociable or unsociable.[61] Thus by subordinating himself to Mitchell, Pringle was pointing to Mitchell as confirmation of the learned intermediary – the serene father figure – that Mitchell would be to Sulzer.[62]

Mitchell's friends were largely drawn from literary, intellectual, or scientific fields. The friendships were genuine ones of conviviality and affection, and need not be mutually advantageous. Mitchell often acted for friends of his own volition in this highly social world of 1730s and 1740s London. One such friendship was with the poet and close friend James Thomson. The exact dating of Mitchell's association with Thomson is hard to establish, but they almost certainly knew one another at Edinburgh University, where Thomson studied an Arts and Divinity in preparation for a career in the clergy, and where Mitchell

---

[60] John Pringle to Andrew Mitchell, 31 January 1743, BL Add MS 6861, f. 187v. This is a reference to Scottish historian William Robertson's character assessments of Charles V of Spain. Just how Pringle referred to Robertson's work on Charles V some twenty-six years before Robertson's major work on that topic is unclear at first. However, tracing his publications back, we find a clear character assessment of Charles V in Robertson's *History of Scotland*, published in 1759. Some of his friends 'reported seeing a manuscript [of the History of Scotland] in 1744', and this could have been shown to Pringle in Edinburgh, prior to his departure for the continent. For the *History of Scotland* characterisation of Charles V, see William Robertson, *The History of Scotland during the reigns of Queen Mary and of King James VI*, Volume 1, Book 1, new edition (London, 1781), pp. 87-88. For the reference to an early manuscript, see Jeffrey R. Smitten, 'Robertson, William (1721-1793)', *ODNB*, at https//doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/23817, accessed 11 January 2018.

[61] The analysis of Robertson's characterisation of Charles V can be found in Neil Hargraves, 'Revelation of character in eighteenth-century historiography and William Robertson's *History of the Reign of Charles V*', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 27 (2003), pp. 23-48. The arguments in this paragraph are drawn from pp. 27, 32-35.

[62] This characterisation of Mitchell as a 'learned intermediary' in the Republic of Letters is more fully explored later in this thesis.

would have been his younger contemporary.[63] Mitchell's attraction to all things English would have resonated well with Thomson, who himself was drawn into the increasing interest in English poetical and literary works at this time.[64] Their friendship continued after Mitchell's Grand Tour.

Locating Mitchell's influence on Thomson and his career is difficult, the more so because there are no surviving letters between them. Nevertheless, it is possible to pinpoint some literary and patronage influences. Mitchell's reflection on his friendship with Thomson was recounted by James Boswell, when he visited Mitchell in Berlin in 1764. It demonstrates Mitchell's keen eye for Thomson's talents but also his flaws. Mitchell saw Thomson's great ability to write in the style of Ovid, but his downfalls, including his ineffectual drama writing,[65] could also extend to overeating – 'he was an egregious gormandiser of beefsteaks' – extravagant generosity, and physical nervousness on the opening nights of his plays.[66] Mitchell advised Thomson against overindulgent extravagance to his friends, Boswell recalled, and Thomson was grateful for it: 'true Friendship and Humanity dwell in his heart', Thomson had written of Mitchell to their mutual friend William Paterson.[67] Mitchell rhapsodised about the opening night of Thomson's *Agamemnon* in 1738, and frequented 'bawdy' dinners full of 'learning, wit [and], honest politicks' with Thomson and their literary circle including David Mallet, John Armstrong, Robert Melville, George Lyttelton and Andrew Millar.[68]

Mitchell seems to have been something of a guiding presence on those around him, particularly those were not so socially advantaged as he. This is one of the central tenets of Mitchell's character and explains much about his work on behalf of others and his embracing of the sociability of the age. Thomson appears to have valued the quiet wisdom with which Mitchell must have advised on his work and his career, particularly in Thomson's public service position. His care for Thomson is expressed by their mutual friend William Paterson, who in September 1742 bade Mitchell to go into the country and look in on their struggling friend: 'Remember to see the Bard and think for him as you have done for many others. I know you love him', Paterson wrote.[69] In 1748, Thomson grew gravely ill following a turbulent trip between London and Richmond in poor weather. He contracted a fever and Mitchell, along with John Armstrong and another, rushed to Thomson's bedside at midnight, but could only witness his death a short while

---

63 McKillop, *Letters and Documents*, p. 202n16. Alexander Dick recalled to Hume how they used to associate with Mitchell and Thomson at Edinburgh University.
64 *The Works of James Thomson, in Two Volumes*, Vol. 1 (London, 1762), p. iv.
65 A view which Voltaire also shared. See McKillop, *Letters and Documents*, p. 212.
66 Marlies K. Danziger, ed, *James Boswell: The journal of his Swiss and German travels, 1764* (Edinburgh and New Haven, 2008), p. 47.
67 Frederick A. Pottle, *Boswell on the Grand Tour: Germany and Switzerland 1764* (Melbourne, London and Toronto, 1953), p. 37; James Thomson to William Paterson, April 1748, in McKillop, *Letters and documents*, p. 197.
68 On the opening night of Agamemnon, see Mitchell's letter to Alexander Boswell in Mossner, *Life of Hume*, p. 108; McKillop in his *Letters and documents* notes several of these dinners in various letters involving Thomson. For the 'bawdy' and learned dinner held by Lyttelton see, pp. 129-130; for the Millar dinners, see pp. 173-174, 205-206.
69 McKillop, *Letters and documents*, pp. 198-199n1.

later.[70] Mitchell told Murdoch that Thomson's death 'nearly sunk' him.[71] Mitchell was lauded by Murdoch in his life of Thomson as 'a gentleman equally noted for the truth and constancy of his private friendships, and for his address and spirit as a public minister', who assisted Lyttelton in bringing Thomson's last work, 'the orphan play *Coriolanus*', to the London stage, with the profits going to Thomson's sisters.[72] Mitchell would act as executor of Thomson's estate alongside Lyttelton.[73] For Thomson's career as well as his person, Mitchell had truly been a father, as Murdoch would later recall.[74]

Mitchell's friendship with Thomson is only a part of the wider and growing influence of Mitchell in literary circles most closely associated with Andrew Millar. The relationship of Millar with his Scots friends, and those Scots authors whom he published, has been used in a paradigmatic way by Richard Sher in his investigation of Millar and publishing in the Enlightenment. As Sher notes, 'the Millar-Thomson relationship', in which Millar patronised the author and selflessly used the profits of his final publication to erect a monument to the Scottish poet in Westminster Abbey, 'shows Millar at his best'.[75] Among his 'literary counsellors' on whom he relied for honest advice on potential publications, Millar counted Mitchell. The importance of Millar to the eighteenth century book trade in Britain is enormous. His personal relationship with authors aside, Millar's handling of countless manuscripts rescued them from possible obscurity, and for this he can thank his sometimes unscrupulous business intelligence, but also, often, his 'triers.'[76] Exactly how Mitchell fit into Millar's literary world contributes more to an understanding of how Mitchell incorporated patronage and literary advice in personal, learned and political connections.[77]

iii. Patronage, literature, and social positioning

Andrew Mitchell's role in the facilitation of publications both by subscription and through patronage speaks to his conception of friendship and mutual assistance. Friendship for Mitchell could be enjoyable for its own sake, but he also took the chances these afforded to advance opportunities for himself and his friends. In doing so, he gained a reputation as a dependable, important, and somewhat influential man. Mitchell

---

[70] *Works of James Thomson*, p. xv. The other person is given as 'Mr Reid', probably Andrew Reid (d. 1767).
[71] Mitchell to Murdoch, 27 August 1748, *Culloden Papers*, CCCLI, p. 306.
[72] *Works of James Thomson*, pp. xv-xvi.
[73] Probate Record in McKillop, *Letters and documents*, pp. 209-210.
[74] Patrick Murdoch to John Forbes, 16 May 1754, *Culloden Papers*, CCCLVIII, pp. 310-311.
[75] Millar did, however, produce other versions and reprints which would have partially offset his costs. See Philip Connell, 'Death and the author: Westminster Abbey and the meanings of the literary monument', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 38 (2005), p. 574.
[76] Sher, *Enlightenment*, particularly pp. 282-290. The influence of Thomson, and thus by extension his populariser and publisher Millar, has been criticised for encouraging English prose over authentic Scottish prose among Scottish authors, however Sher's persuasive position strongly answers these suggestions. See Gerard Carruthers, 'James Thomson and Eighteenth-Century Scottish Literary Identity', in Richard Terry, ed, *James Thomson: Essays for the tercentenary* (Liverpool, 2000), p. 178.
[77] An article in the *Quarterly Review* recounts how Mitchell was seen as nearly 'omnipotent' by his countrymen in securing positions in the government. See *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. 103 (London, 1858), p. 74.

promoted writers and of course dispensed patronage from his office at Undersecretary of State for Scotland and, when that ceased, as an MP for Aberdeenshire, and subsequently Elgin Burghs, in parliament. He subscribed to books, like many eighteenth-century Britons, because it was a way to show support and interest in publications. W. A. Speck suggests some ways we can understand why and how subscription existed, while urging caution against blanket conclusions based on works subscribed for. Speck writes:

> Deducing the literary interests of the subscribers from the contents of books which bear their names is also dubious. All kinds of pressures could lead a man to advance money for a publication beside its intrinsic merits. The ties of a political party, of a university college, of a profession, or even of simple friendship, might well overcome a complete lack of interest in the subject matter of a book acquired in this way.[78]

Nevertheless, Speck argues that we can make some tentative conclusions. Moreover, Speck argues that 'few if any [British readers] would subscribe to a work they disliked', and 'most would feel some sympathy for the views expressed by the author'.[79] Historian P. J. Wallis, researching subscriptions for books in the eighteenth century, argued that no research on a given literary figure 'will be complete unless attention is given to the books subscribed for'.[80] Book subscriptions in the eighteenth century have been researched in some depth, and historians, including Wallis himself, have tested and explored various methods for uncovering what book subscriptions can tell researchers about connections and associations in book production.[81]

As far as can be ascertained, Mitchell subscribed for at least twenty-one books, that can be traced through the Eighteenth-Century Collections Online database. A list of these books can be found in Appendix 1. A number of books were those written by his friends, to which he might naturally have been expected to subscribe. They include Thomson's *The Seasons*, published in 1730, and the posthumous works of Colin Maclaurin on the work of Newton, the publication of which was facilitated in part by Mitchell and edited by Patrick Murdoch.[82] Others to which Mitchell subscribed were printed by Andrew Millar, who as we will see below, was a close friend and correspondent of Mitchell in their London-based Scots circle.

---

[78] W. A. Speck, 'Politicians, peers, and publication by subscription 1700-1750', in Isabel Rivers, ed, *Books and their readers in eighteenth-century England* (New York, 1982), p. 50.
[79] *Ibid.*
[80] P. J. Wallis, 'The book subscription lists project – its relevance for historians of mathematics', *Historia Mathematica*, 2 (1975), p. 323.
[81] Robert Darnton, 'What is the history of books?', *Daedalus*, 111 (1982), pp. 65-83; John Feather, 'The commerce of letters: The study of the eighteenth century book trade', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 17 (1984), pp. 405-424; John Feather, 'British publishing in the eighteenth century: A preliminary subject analysis', *The Library*, s6-VIII (1986), pp. 32-46; P. J. Wallis, 'Book subscription lists', *The Library*, 29 (1974), pp. 256-286.
[82] James Thomson, *The Seasons* (London, 1730); Colin Maclaurin, *An Account of Sir Isaac Newton's Philosophical Discoveries*, ed. P. Murdoch (London, 1748); and another edition of the same, published in 1750.

Mitchell subscribed to four works published by Millar that we know of. No doubt these were recommended to Mitchell because they were amenable to his taste, and, apart from the work by Colin Maclaurin which is one of the four, the others are the first volume of Henry Fielding's *Miscellanies* published in 1743, the first volume of the collected works of Robert Boyle, published in 1744, and the *Orations of Demosthenes*, translated and introduced by the Reverend Philip Francis in 1757. In all, Mitchell's known subscriptions are comprised of his core interests, being philosophy, history, literature, and science, and the works of the ancient Roman and Greek authors. One subscription on the list, the second volume of James Foster's *Discourses on all the principal branches of natural religion and social virtue*, was the product of the lobbying of Foster's friends for Mitchell to subscribe. Mitchell was sent a copy of those who had already subscribed, and his correspondent Alexander Rait, a professor of Philosophy at King's College, Aberdeen, noted giving Mitchell receipts for eight copies of the work, which it seemed Mitchell had asked Rait to sell to his friends on Foster's behalf.[83] This was also the case with Robert Wood's *The Ruins of Palmyra, otherwise Tedmor in the Desart* [sic]. Wood asked Mitchell to find subscribers 'such as you think have a taste for this sort of Virtu'. Wood wrote to Mitchell asking him to subscribe, and sending Mitchell blank subscription forms signed by Wood, for which Wood expected Mitchell to lobby his own friends and facilitate subscriptions.[84]

The first part of this chapter demonstrated Mitchell's capacity to form friendships with literary figures, intellectuals and politicians, and to conduct them with genuine care and affection. It will be argued here that by Mitchell living and behaving in this way, the polite and convivial sociability of his world gradually placed him as a man of dependability, which in no way hurt his political prospects. Similarly, being utilised as a literary observer and advisor showed Mitchell to be held as a man of good judgement, intellect, and discretion. In his seminal book on publishing in eighteenth-century London, Richard Sher rightly showed Andrew Millar as the leading publisher of literature through the middle of the century. Sher contends that Mitchell may have been one of Millar's 'triers'; those who read prospective publications for Millar and gave him their observations, thoughts, and opinions.[85] There is anecdotal evidence that this occurred.[86] First, what must be addressed is Mitchell's role in the Society for the Encouragement of Learning, an early philanthropic society which aimed to publish books deemed important for society, but which publishers, for their own reasons, usually refused to take up.

The Society aimed to help authors publish their works which otherwise would not have found a market. While it was not universally popular – Richard Bentley is often quoted to demonstrate the revulsion

[83] Alexander Rait to Andrew Mitchell, 18 June 1749, BL Add MS 58289, f. 138. The list in the preceding folio sent to Mitchell lists some influential people, written in Rait's hand: Sir Arthur Forbes (Mitchell's close friend and later his heir); Andrew Stone (the private secretary to the Duke of Newcastle); Patrick Simson, Minister at Kemnay; John Chalmers, then Principal of King's College Aberdeen; his sub-principal Alexander Burnett; professor of Medicine Dr. James Gregory; professor of Philosophy Dr. John Gregory; and Rait himself.
[84] Robert Wood to Andrew Mitchell, 10 May 1752, BL Add MS 58290, f. 70.
[85] Sher, *Enlightenment*, p. 283.
[86] Nathaniel Wraxall, *Historical memoirs of my own time* (London, 1904), p. 33; Henry Fielding, *Amelia*, ed. Martin Battestin (Oxford, 1983), p. xlv.

some felt toward a publically-accessible, subscription-based publication scheme[87] – it did possess, as Alexander Gordon wrote to Samuel Richardson, members 'conspicuous for their quality and station, or leaning and ingenuity'.[88] Yet the fracas between Bentley and the society tapped into a larger problem, for which the Society had been founded, namely, to address the needs of authors against the prejudices and unscrupulous business practices of the booksellers.

Mitchell joined the society at its second meeting, on 27 May 1736.[89] Among the founding members were a number of Mitchell's friends and acquaintances, including George Lewis Scott, James Thomson, Sir Arthur Forbes, Jerome de Salis, and Thomas Birch. Early in 1737 they were joined by the Duke of Richmond, familiar to Mitchell from the Society of Dilettanti. Committee members were appointed annually, with the bulk of the committee rotating and only a small number retained for the following year. Mitchell served on the committee on two occasions, between February 1737 to Feb 1738, and again February 1744 to February 1745. Almost from its inception the society battled several problems, which were later listed methodically in its minute book. They included the difficulties and costs associated with the necessity of working with booksellers, whose thirty-percent take of book sales made a large negative impact on the society's funds; the costs of offices, storage, and printing of books; and the large arrears of members' fees. Of this last, Andrew Mitchell was also culpable, and at 1746, owed six years of membership fees, amounting to £12 and 12 shillings.[90] Many others owed more. Problems mounted for the society. In a general circular to members, they noted that the affairs of the society 'are brought to such a crisis, which without some speedy remedy must necessarily put a stop to the progress of their generous and useful design'.[91] Again they blamed membership fee arrears as the biggest hindrance to their success, but also maintained a problematic relationship with booksellers. Christine Gerrard has noted that the Society 'was doomed to failure since its publications were deliberately sabotaged by the bookselling mafiosi'.[92] The society noted the necessity of removing themselves from the 'evil' of booksellers' commissions.

> The society being since last Michaelmas happily disingaged [sic] from the former contract with their three booksellers, Messrs Millar, Nourse, and Gray, who by the enormous allowance of thirty three per cent if not more, for vending their books, have brought the affairs of the society low, and defeated hitherto the generous intention of its institution.[93]

---

[87] J. H. Monk, *The Life of Richard Bentley, D.D.*, Vol. 2, (London, 1833), p. 395.
[88] Alexander Gordon to Rev. Samuel Richardson, 8 Dec 1736, in John Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. 1 (1812), pp. 90-91.
[89] References, dates, and quotations in this paragraph taken from the Society for the Encouragement of Learning Minute Book, BL Add MS 6185.
[90] *Ibid.*, f. 80.
[91] *Ibid.,* f. 80^{v}.
[92] Christine Gerrard, *The patriot opposition to Walpole: Politics, poetry, and national myth, 1725-1742* (Oxford, 1994), p. 55. Gerrard also notes the distinctly 'oppositional' nature of the Society's membership. See Part iv of this chapter for further discussion.
[93] Society for the Encouragement of Learning Minute Book, BL Add MS 6185, ff. 39^{v}-40^{r}.

Mitchell's contributions to the society are not made absolutely clear. He definitely participated twice on the annual committee, and must have contributed to the annual reports required of the committee, where they detailed the society's finances, their publications under way, and those under consideration, as well as infrastructure questions. During his first tenure on the committee, the society published, or accepted for publication, the papers of Sir Thomas Roe, an edition of Maximus Tyrius, and accepted its most successful publication, a work on musculature by Alexander Stuart. The society also moved into its new premises in St. Martin's Lane, which doubled as its warehouse. During his second tenure on the committee, the society entered a period of consolidation in which it became clear that their noble objective was becoming more about recouping publishing and bookselling costs rather than promoting new books.[94]

The booksellers, some alleged, had extorted the benevolent subscription market (such as that engaged in by the Society) for their own gain and left their lifeblood, the authors, struggling. James Thomson wrote to his fellow poet Aaron Hill that 'In lieu of all patrons that have been, are, or will be, in England, I wish we had one good Act of Parliament for securing to authors the property of their own works'.[95] Terry Belanger has shown that London booksellers had a tight control on many aspects of the book market, which could negatively influence the writers. According to Belanger, it was natural for booksellers to invest more in reprints of successful books, and that they did not have the time to wait for a return on newer, more speculative publications. Certainly, as Belanger shows, the booksellers' fight for control of perpetual copyrights (which they lost) reaffirms what Thomson told Hill about the vulnerability of authors and the lack of recompense for their work relative to that of the booksellers.[96] 'The most common form of payment between publisher and writer in the eighteenth century', Belanger writes, 'was no payment at all. The idea that writers should receive payment for their work gained force during this period, but before mid-century, the transaction might go either direction'.[97] The Society had a beneficent aim, to wrest control of author's rights from the booksellers and return it to the authors themselves.[98] For some, like Bentley, this was deemed an insult to their intellectual work. For others, like Samuel Johnson, a fine line was to be trod between accepting of the opportunity and accepting the perception of what publication by the society represented. The revered Johnson had, we are told, an urgent need to sell his play *Irene* (though no details are given). It was a contradiction for Johnson to pursue this line, and although he personally did not solicit the society to publish his work, his close friend Edward Cave asked Thomas Birch, a member of the society and a close friend of Mitchell, if the society would be interested in publishing the

[94] *Ibid.*, f. 75.
[95] Christine Gerrard, *Aaron Hill: Muses projector 1685-1750* (Oxford, 2003), p. 185.
[96] Terry Belanger, 'Publishers and writers in eighteenth-century England', in Rivers, ed, *Books and their readers*, pp. 10-11.
[97] *Ibid.*, p. 21.
[98] David McKitterick, *A History of the Cambridge University Press*, Vol. 2, *Scholarship and Commerce 1698-1872* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 160-161.

play.[99] The type of patronage offered by the society was one which Johnson had spoken of in less than glowing terms.[100]

The difficulty lay, as has been outlined, in the complex relationship of booksellers to authors. The Society, though patronised by wealthy noblemen and gentry alike, could not escape the need for publishers and booksellers to assist in the operation. Andrew Millar, naturally, was involved;[101] as were James Brindley and John Nourse, John Peele, James Crokatt, Samuel Birt, Mary and Thomas Cooper, and others. R. M. Wiles has pointed out the objective view which can be taken of the activities of the society and its booksellers: on the one hand, there is the altruistic motive of putting 'middle-class money' to work on admirable literary projects; on the other, there was the derogatory interpretation of such unglamorous literary interests by such publications as the influential *Grub Street Journal*.[102] Others who have retrospectively analysed the work of the society lament its inability to disentangle the booksellers from their noble aims. The association of the booksellers with the society caused alarm and scepticism. 'I suppose this Society for encouraging learning alarms the Booksellers', wrote William Clarke to the society's secretary and printer William Bowyer, 'for it must be at last a downright Trading Society, a mere CONGER'. When quoting this work, the literary historian John Nichols explained that a conger was the set of printers established to assist the society, and alluded to the 'Conger Eel, which is supposed to swallow the smaller fry'.[103] Bentley's biographer said that no sooner had the society partnered with booksellers, that the latter turned the relative lack of profit into a weapon with which to remove the society as an obstacle to their business.[104]

The long list of authors who benefited from the society, however, speak to its noble work in generating public interest in rather unacclaimed intellectual work. It was 'an impulse of public spirit' which allowed such memorable publications as Thomas Carte's *Collection of Original Letters … 1641 to 1660* (1739), Alexander Stuart's *Dissertatio de Structura et Motu Musculari* (1738) (which Montesquieu found so captivating), and Aaron Hill's *Tears of the muses: A satire* (1737). Hill, like Carte – a proponent of public libraries in Britain[105] – was naturally drawn to the beneficence of the society. 'You are such enemies of every kind of corruption', Hill wrote the society in the dedication of *Tears of the muses*:

> How many great and desirable Changes in literary Taste, may we not reasonably expect, from the associated Prevalence of Numbers, united, as *you* are, upon the most generous Principle

[99] The intention also seems to have been for the society to liaise with theatres to have the play performed. See James Boswell, *The Life of Samuel Johnson*, 7th ed., Vol. 1, (London, 1811), p. 125. Aaron Hill also hoped the society might take up producing plays for the stage. See Gerrard, *Aaron Hill*, p. 185.
[100] Paul J. Korshin, 'Types of eighteenth-century literary patronage', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 7 (1974), p. 454.
[101] Sandro Jung, *David Mallet, Anglo-Scot: Poetry, patronage, and politics in the age of union* (Newark, 2008), p. 76.
[102] R. M. Wiles, *Serial publication in England before 1750* (Cambridge, 1957), p. 259.
[103] John Nichols, *Biographical and literary anecdotes of William Bowyer* (London, 1782), p. 137.
[104] Monk, *Richard Bentley*, p. 396.
[105] Isaac Disraeli, *Miscellanies of literature*, Vol. 1 (New York, 1841), p. 224.

> in Nature, an unprofitable and voluntary Pursuit of the Benefit of Others, from Effect of your own Cost, and Labour?[106]

The society could not flourish without sold out editions – of which Stuart's work may have been the only one – and the cooperation of the booksellers. It ceased its operations in 1749, with the booksellers being largely blamed for not doing enough to promote the altruistic endeavours of Mitchell and company.[107] By the same token, it was recognised that books are largely sold 'by force of recommendation or common vogue, [rather]…'

> than the Judgment of the Reader, after a full and impartial Examination; and therefore a Bookseller, confident of the intrinsic value of his Book, can boldly recommend it, even to his Best Customers (which he would not, or ought not to do otherwise) when he knows it to be in his own interest.[108]

Patronage could lead to independence, and remained vitally important.[109] Patronage was also, as Mitchell was to discover in the political realm, a device of control, representing, as Gerald Newman has termed it, a 'ubiquitous godfatherism' best represented by the Pelhams, among others. Newman characterises the quest for patronage in the mid-eighteenth century thus:

> The tale of eighteenth-century politics is largely an unedifying one of shifting coalitions of powerful landholders manoeuvring and grappling for plunder, all the while talking solemnly of Whig principles and luring into their camps younger men to talk the same stuff better. Flattery and insincere declamation were the meat and potatoes of politics…[110]

When it came to literary patronage, which is the focus of this section, there were mixed aims for patron and author alike. Dustin Griffin has noted that patronage could entail many things, and it is rather pointless to suggest that patronage was always carried out with the aim of a pension or for advancement. The 'inextricable mix' of writing and politics, as Griffin argues, meant that service and merit were not clearly

---

[106] Aaron Hill, *The tears of the muses: a satire*, 2nd ed. (London, 1738), p. v.
[107] Atto, 'Society for the Encouragement of Learning', pp. 269, 273.
[108] *A Letter to the Society of Booksellers* (London, 1738), p. 29.
[109] McKitterick, *History*, p. 161.
[110] Gerald Newman, *The rise of English nationalism: A cultural history, 1740-1830* (London, 1987), p. 23.

delineated, and authors cannot be evenly divided between 'servants of art and the servants of political paymasters'.[111] J. C. D. Clark has argued that the 'black picture of the establishment' has been used by historians to misrepresent the aims and operations of patronage.[112] For Mitchell, the interconnection of intellectual pursuits and patronage was becoming clearer. His own traceable subscriptions underscore his interests in diplomacy, classical learning, mathematics, poetry, social morality, and modern history.[113] This is in no place better demonstrated than his intermediary work between the Duke of Newcastle and Thomas Blackwell, Principal of Marischal College, Aberdeen. As Paul Korshin has pointed out, patronage came in many forms, and occasions when a literary figure or intellectual came under the patronage of another could often be interpreted in political terms. Dustin Griffin goes further, suggesting that literary patronage was *always* political.[114] Korshin has shown how patronage did not always equate to financial support and how, in lieu of this, political appointments could buy both literary support, and allegiance.[115] This is also touched upon by Griffin, who notes that not only was the 'golden age' of handsome pensions for authors dedicating books to patrons a myth in the eighteenth century, but also that patronage was to a great extent an 'economic' arrangement beneficial to both parties in more ways that finance.[116] There is no doubt that aristocratic patronage certainly still attached a level of importance to a publication.[117]

However, as will be argued later in this chapter, patronage worked on various levels and, as Undersecretary of State for Scotland, Andrew Mitchell formed something of a gateway to Tweeddale and the patronage that could be applied in many cases in Scotland. When Mitchell received news-type letters from people such as the eminent clergyman and writer Robert Wallace – with whom he had been in the Rankenian Club[118] – they often contained combinations of patronage requests, and scholarly news. In addition, one letter to Mitchell can often create signposts for us to note other areas of his influence. For example, in 1752, Wallace wrote to Mitchell requesting Mitchell's help to have Wallace's son given one of the vacant philosophy chairs at Marishall College, Aberdeen.[119] Wallace recognised that the two vacant chairs were in the gift of the crown, meaning support might be gained from Mitchell. Wallace recalled that Mitchell assisted his previous effort to place his son in a position, and supported his argument by writing that his son was the best candidate: 'I know you wish me well & will be glad of an opportunity to do me a substantial service. I have again given you this trouble & hope you will be kind enough to improve this occasion than which a better can scarce be found'. The same letter contained news of Wallace's exchanges with David Hume over calculations of ancient populations, with Wallace noting that 'probably you have

[111] Dustin Griffin, *Literary patronage in England, 1650-1800* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 67-68.
[112] Clark, *The dynamics of change*, p. 2.
[113] A list of Mitchell's known subscriptions is provided in Appendix 1. The strong link to diplomacy is provided by his subscription to Rymer's *Foedera*. Formerly Historiographer Royal, Rymer's compiled a centuries-long list of agreements forged between England and foreign powers.
[114] Griffin, *Literary patronage in England*, p. 45.
[115] Korshin, 'Patronage', pp. 454-455.
[116] Griffin, *Literary patronage in England*, p. 10.
[117] F. J. G. Robinson and P. J. Wallis, *Book subscription lists. A revised guide* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1975), p. 3.
[118] 'Memoirs of Dr Wallace of Edinburgh', p. 340.
[119] Robert Wallace to Andrew Mitchell, 4 February 1752, BL Add MS 58290, f. 3. The remainder of this paragraph draws on this letter.

heard of or seen David Hume's *Political Discourses*'. Thus in one letter we have Wallace's application for patronage support; a discussion of Wallace and Hume's latest work; and news from Edinburgh about the political nature of Hume's selection as Keeper of the Advocates Library. An undercurrent of this letter is Wallace's past, and his political allegiance. As noted, he was familiar to Mitchell from the Rankenian Club, but he was also a clergyman as Mitchell's father had been, and, through his involvement in the administration of the church in Scotland, Wallace had come to align himself with the Squadrone interest.[120] When it comes to Mitchell, therefore, patronage often worked simultaneously with his other interests, which of course also intersected in letters.

In early 1755, Thomas Blackwell, exhausted after thirty years of 'lifting a sunken university', applied to Andrew Mitchell for his facilitation of the Duke of Newcastle's patronage.[121] The ultimate aim, Blackwell said, was to obtain the position of Historiographer Royal. Not only was the Duke in a position to shoehorn Blackwell into this position newly vacated by the death of Jenkin Thomas Philipps, he could also count on Blackwell's overt and implicit Whig support.[122] The office has been considered a sinecure and the previous occupant had been tutor to George II's children. The eventual winner of the position, Richard Stonehewer, was a close friend of the Duke of Grafton.

It is clear that Blackwell hoped Mitchell could bring about a mark of favour, whether financial or titular, from Newcastle or Henry Pelham. Though the dedication to Henry Pelham of the first volume of Blackwell's *Memoirs of the Court of Augustus* (1753) would not have brought him large financial gain, the rewards by association would not have hurt sales, nor would it have hurt Blackwell's chances of support by the Newcastle circle.[123] In the dedication, Blackwell put his case that the union of learning with a rationality concerning men in business, was the only way in which a man could meaningfully conduct his life. In doing so, Blackwell plainly allowed for the pragmatism with which a dedication of a learned book could procure the political support of the dedicatee – in this case, Pelham. Learned men and men of business must remain ineffective, Blackwell wrote, 'untill Converse with *Books* continue with Knowledge of *Men*, and, like *Art* and *Genius* in Poetry, mutually correct the Faults and supply the Defects of one another.'[124]

---

[120] The memoir of Wallace by his son notes that the termination of the office of Secretary of State for Scotland deprived Wallace of his 'noble patron', Tweeddale. See 'Memoirs of Dr Wallace of Edinburgh', p. 343. See also B. Barnett Cochran, 'Wallace, Robert (1697-1771)', *ODNB*, at https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/28539, accessed 2 August 2018.

[121] BL Add MS 58291, f. 24ʳ.

[122] Blackwell's strong Scottish Whig sympathies were known to many, and while his attachment to liberty repulsed Samuel Johnson, Mitchell evidently held them in high regard, and so by extension, did Newcastle. For the 'extreme severity which with Johnson treated him', see Joseph Towers, *An essay on the life and character of Dr. Samuel Johnson* (London, 1786), pp. 104-105. The implicit trust in political support seems to have been a given in appointments to Historiographer Royal, where the incumbent's role was to officially sanction, apologise for, or support the motives of the government. See Denys Hay, 'The Historiographers Royal in England and Scotland', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 30 (1951), p. 22.

[123] Korshin, 'Patronage', p. 468.

[124] Thomas Blackwell, *Memoirs of the Court of Augustus*, Vol. 1 (1753), p. 1.

It is in the aftermath of Pelham's death in 1754 that Blackwell contacted Newcastle's secretary John Roberts – the former secretary to Newcastle's brother Henry Pelham – to enquire as to the likelihood of patronage for himself. Blackwell told Mitchell that Pelham had pledged his support but was unable to deliver it before his death. Now Blackwell hoped that Mitchell, Roberts, and Andrew Stone, could raise him up to a level of patronage with Newcastle.[125] The presence of Roberts and Stone in Blackwell's supplications to Mitchell entertains the possibility of Mitchell's closer connection to those men, and the seat of power in Newcastle's orbit. Roberts had been for many years the distributor of secret service funds under Pelham, and had amassed a large personal wealth from sinecures.[126] Stone, for many years the most important figure in Newcastle's personal life and political career, was variously seen as the most complete behind-the-scenes political figure of the first half of the eighteenth century, and as 'a cold mysterious man of little plausibility'.[127]

Blackwell's motives become clearer in his ensuing letters to Mitchell, where he again expresses his desire for one hundred guineas promised him by Pelham.[128] I can find no other cause for this except the dedication to Pelham of Blackwell's previously mentioned work. Blackwell laments his distance from court and its advantages, and though he asks Mitchell to put his case with Newcastle, the Lord Chancellor (Hardwicke), and the Earl of Granville, he states that: 'even tho the Historiographer place be given – or promised away – [Blackwell is] entering a kind of Claim for what may offer hereafter,' before reiterating his hopes for the one hundred guineas, on which he received positive news from Roberts.[129]

At its heart, the issue lay with Mitchell's ability to put his case to Newcastle, to facilitate the patronage and intellectual endeavour which would pervade Mitchell's career, for 'if you do not mention it to the Duke and take proper Steps to keep it agoing, I will never touch a Shilling of it'.[130] Blackwell's case which he put directly to Newcastle also cited his life dedicated to crown, country, Newcastle, and the propagation of liberty and loyalty.[131] The intensity of Blackwell's efforts for patronage were not lost on Mitchell nor Newcastle. He lobbied Stone, successfully, to persuade Newcastle to accept the dedication for the second volume of his *Memoirs of the Court of Augustus*, and also badgered Mitchell to concert with Stone in persuading Newcastle, Hardwicke, and anyone else interested.[132] Despite the interest of Mitchell and his powerful friends, Blackwell was not appointed Historiographer Royal. What this example shows, however,

---

125 Blackwell to Mitchell, BL Add MS 58291, ff. 20^{r}-21^{r}.
126 Martyn J. Powell, 'Roberts, John (1711/12-1772)', *ODNB*; Lewis Namier debunked some of the myth around Roberts' power, promoted by contemporary writers, which included his distribution of secret funds to Pelham's 'pensioners' and George II's 'private account.' See Lewis Namier, *The structure of politics at the accession of George III*, Vol. 1 (London, 1929), p. 220.
127 A. F. Pollard, *rev.* M. J. Mercer, 'Stone, Andrew (1703-1773)', *ODNB*.
128 Blackwell to Mitchell, BL Add MS 58291, f. 24.
129 *Ibid*, f. 24^{v}.
130 *Ibid.*
131 Blackwell to Newcastle, 3 March 1755, BL Add MS 58291, f. 26.
132 Blackwell to Mitchell, 22 March 1755, BL Add MS 58291, f. 39.

is the alignment of intellectual pursuit with political allegiances that was to be a strong current of Mitchell's career, and those of many of the men around him.

iv. London learned societies and social advancement

It has been seen that Mitchell's literary involvement aligned him with a certain intellectual milieu. The members of these circles overlapped to a certain degree with Squadrone or Whig political circles, and while politics was not the sole focus of these groups – sometimes it was not discussed at all[133] – these members possibly played a mutually supportive role in terms of the aims and achievements of the societies. For example, Christine Gerrard has noted that the founding group of the Society for the Encouragement of Learning, where Mitchell was a founding member, 'seems to have had a distinctively oppositional cast'.[134] This will be seen further into this part, where the sense of civic duty present in some of these societies resounded with elements of the Squadrone and Whig political values. But to analyse the way in which his patronage and facilitation aligned with his other interests is to tell only half the story. Mitchell's involvement in intellectual clubs and learned societies certainly played an equally large part in his social advancement, and to a certain degree, his professional advancement. This part of the thesis asks, what did it mean to participate in a learned society? What did it mean for Mitchell's friends, the authors? Was his involvement merely a means to a political end? We have seen Mitchell's comment, upon attending Tencin's salon in Paris, that he embraced learned conversation for its own sake, and was delighted that his fellow attendees eschewed 'scandal and politics, the topics of vulgar conversation'. His attendance at such learned gatherings cannot thus be categorically deemed to be a political imperative. We have also seen the beneficent altruism of the Society for the Encouragement of Learning that was eventually to falter under the weight of the bookselling business. Did Mitchell sense this early on? If so, did he see involvement in learned societies as a more efficient political expedient to advance his career, or as an intellectual pursuit that happily married with politics?

Participation in learned societies, and the idea of social advancement, were not mutually exclusive. Mitchell participated in learned societies under the idea of personal enjoyment, but also social advancement, because his conception of them was that they overlapped naturally. From the mid 1730s, Andrew Mitchell joined the Royal Society, the Society of Dilettanti, the Society for the Encouragement of Learning, the Society of Antiquaries, and The Egyptian Club (1741). Noting Mitchell's membership of the Society of Dilettanti and the Society of Antiquaries at this time serves to correct Arthur MacGregor's contention that

[133] Arthur MacGregor, 'Forming an identity: The early Society and its context, 1707-1751', in Susan Pearce, ed, *Visions of antiquity: The Society of Antiquaries of London 1707-2007* (London, 2007), pp. 57-58.
[134] Gerrard, *The patriot opposition to Walpole*, p. 55.

these groups did not share a single common member until Joseph Banks.[135] Indeed, there is a solid trail of evidence for Mitchell's early participation in the Society of Antiquaries, though he discontinued his attendance after 1741.[136] Mitchell's associations, and the manner in which he conducted himself in these societies, demonstrates his understanding that his 'known employment' was as a lawyer, with the practice of his intellectual life enabling his social and political life. Mitchell's education in law, originally seen as a 'liberal profession', came to be seen as a 'learned profession'. The semantic difference is important here because, on one level, 'liberal' connoted political and intellectual freedom,[137] and on the other level, 'learned' signified intellectual accomplishment but also a civic duty. Mitchell saw his duty, as Joseph Priestley argued, as being carried out through the propagation of knowledge, which also contributed to his knowledge of politics and affairs of state.[138] The characteristic virtues of the age, through which many Britons identified themselves as the inheritors of a classical Roman or Greek legacy, was played out in a number of early societies, such as the Society of Roman Knights founded in 1722, the Roman Club founded in 1723 and surviving until 1743, a second Roman Club founded by Gibbon in 1765, and the Society of Dilettanti.[139] The latter superseded the early incarnation of the Roman Club, and is our focus.

The themes of Mitchell's early London career were to grow his network and to advance himself professionally and intellectually. In these years he was studying for the English bar, and his social commitments flourished. Mitchell joined, within a year of one another, the Royal Society of London, and the Society of Dilettanti.[140] The two societies contrasted drastically in their aim, their history, and their conduct. The most lasting label that has shaped the perception of the Dilettanti is probably that given it by Horace Walpole, who remarked that the Dilettanti Society was 'a club for which the nominal qualification is having been in Italy, and the real one, being drunk.'[141] Walpole's stinging observation was no doubt partially true – the society charged innumerable drinking and monetary fines for seemingly trifling matters

---

[135] MacGregor, 'Forming an identity', p. 55. Mitchell is listed as a 'first or modern fellow' of the Society of Antiquaries at *A Copy of the Royal Charter and Statutes of the Society of Antiquaries of London* (London, 1800), p. 12.
[136] Mitchell the Society of Antiquaries for the first time on 20 May 1736, when Martin Folkes was President. He was proposed as a member on 18 March 1735/6 by Folkes and Walter Bowman, who would later be elected to the Royal Society. In all, I have found fifteen occasions on which Mitchell attended. See Society of Antiquaries, Minute Books, Microfilm, Vols 2, 3 and 4. In Vol. 2, pp. 164, 165, 170, 179, and a further illegible page, dated 3 February 1736/7. In Vol. 3, see pp. 107, 114, 172, 185, 192, 208, 249. In Vol. 4, see pp. 50, 89 (London, 1980).
[137] Bruce A. Kimball, *The 'true professional ideal' in America: A history* (Lanham and London, 1995), pp. 101-102.
[138] This is something Priestley noted as a shortcoming in the men being educated in his day. See Joseph Priestley, 'An Essay on a Course of Liberal Education for Civil and Active Life' (1764), pp. 1-3, in Joseph Priestley, *Lectures on History and General Policy* (London, 1793).
[139] For some notes on the Society of Roman Knights, led by William Stukeley, see Rosemary Sweet, *Antiquaries: The discovery of the past in eighteenth-century Britain* (London and New York, 2004), pp. 164-165; for the first Roman Club, see Richard H. Saunders, *John Smibert: Colonial America's first portrait painter* (New Haven and London, 1995), p. 43; for Gibbon's Roman Club, see John Lord Sheffield, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Edward Gibbon*, Vol. 2 (London, 1830), p. 197.
[140] Mitchell was a member at the first recorded meeting of the society, 2 May 1736. Fraser reports that the society was actually founded in 1732, when Mitchell would have been on his Grand Tour, however no records exist of any meetings prior to 2 May 1736. See William Fraser, ed, *The Members of the Society of Dilettanti 1736-1874* (London, 1874), p. 2.
[141] Horace Walpole to Horace Mann, 14 April 1743 OS, in W. S. Lewis, ed, *Horace Walpole's Correspondence*, Vol. 18 (New Haven, 1937-1983), pp. 208-211.

such as toasting, incorrectly toasting, leaving dinners without being excused, calling the Society a Club, placing coffee on the table, and more.[142] Their most recent and authoritative examiner, Jason Kelly, concurs that the society's early years were little more than as a convivial dining society.[143] However, beyond the drinking, the society's values and aims ran deep. In this 'associational world' as Peter Clark has termed it, there were several dynamics at play: the individual and the group; the community and the society; masculine libertinism and polite sociability.[144] There was no doubt that the Dilettanti saw their group as an opportunity for the outpouring of masculine libertinism, as demonstrated briefly above with the drinking references.[145] However, these dynamics deserve greater analysis for the way in which they contributed to Mitchell's future career and social advancement. A short analysis of Jason Kelly's work will provide ample evidence of these junctures.

Dilettantism, as a label and as a word, entered the English vocabulary only with the Society that utilised it. The word entailed a delight in fine things, without a definitive specialisation in any given area. The common roots of political belief brought the men together in a spirit of virtue, liberty, and freedom of expression, under the general banner of polite sociability characteristic of the 1730s. Kelly points out that the adoption of an early motto, *esto praeclara, esto perpetua* – 'let it be noble, let it endure forever' – drew upon Venetian republicanism while also echoing a greater desire that their communal work as a society would be appreciated, and would grow.[146] Most characteristic of the Dilettanti, Kelly notes, is the 'culture of sensibility' that allowed a 'genuine emotive response and understanding of one's associates', devoid of the strictures and hierarchies of formal social interaction.[147] Polite sociability was by no means irreconcilable with differing understandings of the boundaries and definitions of libertinism and libertines. The term describes the Dilettanti rather aptly – rather than live to a 'dogmatic code' of alcoholism or carnal desire, as the society were often accused of, their version of libertinism, which Mitchell himself must have also enacted to some degree, was an assertion of individuality within a coded polite society, and could be utilised or dropped according to setting, company, and activity.[148] It should by no means prescribe an understanding of how the early Dilettanti would have seen themselves, for as Kelly argues, their lifestyle involved the promotion of knowledge and learning on the one hand, and excess engagement in sensual pleasures on the other, which were seen as complementary rather than opposite or contradictory.[149]

---

142 Lionel Cust, *History of the Society of Dilettanti*, ed. Sidney Colvin (London, 1914), p. 35.
143 Jason Kelly, *The Society of Dilettanti: Archaeology and identity in the British Enlightenment* (New Haven and London, 2009), pp. xvi, 9.
144 Clark, *British clubs and societies*, pp. 1-25.
145 Jason M. Kelly, 'Riots, revelries, and rumor: Libertinism and masculine association in Enlightenment London', *Journal of British Studies*, 45 (2006), p. 778. Kelly's *Society of Dilettanti* outlines this again in Chapter 2, particularly pp. 61-73.
146 Kelly, *Society of Dilettanti*, pp. 12-13.
147 *Ibid.*, p. 19.
148 *Ibid.*, p. 36.
149 *Ibid.*, pp. 37, 55-56, 59.

It is not known whether the Society of Dilettanti first met in London, or in Italy on the Grand Tour, but it is generally agreed that the idea was first formed in 1734, and a list of rules can be found in the Society's archives that states that the Society was begun the first Sunday in December 1734.[150] No minutes were kept until March 1736, which is where Andrew Mitchell is listed. He is listed alongside a number of the eminent men drawn from politics and public life, and who in one way or another, mostly contributed to the flowering of British social-intellectual life in the eighteenth century: Charles Sackville, earl of Middlesex; Simon Harcourt, Viscount Harcourt and later earl; Robert Montagu, duke of Manchester; Francis Dashwood; Thomas Villiers, later earl of Clarendon; Robert Hay, later Archbishop of York; and Hugh Smithson, later earl of Northumberland.[151] While Mitchell is listed as 'abdicated', as are many members, this refers only to a rule where members could not miss six or more meetings while in England; Mitchell's participation in the Society is demonstrated into the late 1730s and 1740s by archival records, as will be explored below. The Society had begun with a definite interest in classical Rome, despite its later turn toward the promotion of Greece.

The dress, the rules, and the very makeup of the society in its earliest form was ritualistic, something that Peter Clark has labelled 'masonic and pseudo-masonic activity,' derived from the observance of ancient rituals.[152] While sometimes irreverent, the motions and orders made by the society to equip itself with adequate regalia, pomp and ceremony draws heavily on the Roman learning of its members. The President wore a scarlet toga; was to be seated in a replica of the *sella Curulis* which the Roman emperors had occupied; his Secretary to be dressed, initially, in a costume resembling Machiavelli; a kind of reliquary box was ordered, entitled 'Bacchus's Tomb', and contained finances, new member votes, dinner money, and the book of forfeitures; and new members toasted with a sombre initiation ceremony conducted in absolute silence.[153] Several mottos were floated, of which Horace Walpole would have argued that *nunc est bibendum* was most applicable – yet *Seria Ludo*, roughly translating as serious play, was to last.[154] The society's Roman roots, and its belief in *seria ludo* continued to be paraded through George Knapton's portraits of the members, in which the punchbowl in Bourchier Wray's portrait declares *Dulce est desipere in loco*, or 'tis sweet at the fitting time to cast serious thoughts aside.'[155] The Roman representations were neither new nor original in England: the spirit of Roman values had been equated since the Glorious Revolution of 1688 with English liberty and the promotion of civic virtue, and flowed through in the actions of politicians late

[150] Society of Dilettanti, *Society's Rules and Attendance Lists*, 1736 (Volumes 1736-1993).
[151] Cust, *History*, pp. 239-245, lists the original 1736 members with career profiles.
[152] Clark, *British Clubs*, p. 78.
[153] Bruce Redford, *Dilettanti: The antic and the antique in eighteenth-century England* (Los Angeles, 2008), pp. 5-7. The dress most probably resembled Di Tito's portrait of Machiavelli, which the Dilettanti might have seen while in Florence on the Grand Tour.
[154] *Ibid.*, p. 3. *Nunc est bibendum*=now is the time to drink. The others that lasted were 'Grecian Taste and Roman Spirit', which became a common toast, and 'Viva la Virtu.'
[155] Bruce Redford, "Seria Ludo': George Knapton's portraits of the Society of Dilettanti', *The British Art Journal*, 3 (2001), pp. 56-68.

into the eighteenth century.[156] Perhaps the Dilettanti were also aware, like many of their contemporaries, that Greek and Roman gentlemen had also participated in voluntary societies for the improvement of knowledge.[157] Yet the elements of civic virtue, liberty, and the Dilettanti do not tie together so neatly. Certainly many of its early members would have been dissatisfied, as was the populace at large, with the re-election of Robert Walpole's government in the mid 1730s, but their activities were never overtly political in this early stage, despite some of the early members causing a riot in London on 30 January 1734/35, the anniversary of Charles I's execution.[158]

What, then, was in it for Mitchell? And conversely, what did he bring to the society? His credentials in the Roman authors are certainly not open to dispute. Not only did he reference a wide range of Roman authors on his Grand Tour (which segued directly into his membership of the Dilettanti), but Mitchell compiled a notebook of over 100 folio pages of notes on the works of Cicero.[159] The civic virtue elements in Cicero's life and work are components that Mitchell evaluated independently of the society, as it was clear that the society had no sort of agenda in that direction. The clear links to Mitchell's motivations as a member come through the ideological strands of his writings and analysis of the classical Roman authors.[160] In Cicero, Mitchell had found a methodology for political strength and inner fortitude, and conducted a systematic annotation of the complete works of the Roman politician and philosopher.[161] He was not alone. As Reed Browning has argued, one of the dominant Whig factions, the Court Whigs, were highly attached to Cicero. According to Browning, Cicero 'gave Court Whigs a splendid exemplification of the virtues of that style of thought appropriate to expediential thinking – the virtues, that is, of common sense, moderation, toleration, forbearance, and of the broad over the narrow perspective'.[162] Though Mitchell had for some time associated with members of the Patriot opposition to Walpole, as well as members of the Court Whigs, his interest in Cicero would later give him a deep connection to the ideologies of the Court Whigs when he moved into the Undersecretaryship of State and parliamentary realm.[163] Moreover, Cicero's

---

156 Philip Ayres, *Classical culture and the idea of Rome in eighteenth century England* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 2; Joseph M. Levine, 'Why neoclassicism? Politics and culture in eighteenth-century England', *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 25 (2002), pp. 75-101.
157 Clark, *British Clubs*, p. 13.
158 H. T. Dickinson, 'Popular politics in the age of Walpole', in Jeremy Black, ed, *Britain in the age of Walpole* (Basingstoke and London, 1992), pp. 55-57. The encounter with the early Dilettantes and the public on 30 January 1734/35 unhappily associated the Dilettantes with 'Calves-Head Clubs', former groups which sporadically arose on this date to mark the anniversary of Charles I's beheading by drinking claret from a calve's head. See Kelly, *Society of Dilettanti*, p. 12; Kelly, 'Riots, revelries, and rumor,' noted above.
159 Mitchell mostly consulted Roman sources, as well as Addison on Italy, in the context of geographical landmarks, history, and understanding art, sculpture and politics. Among many, he consulted Ovid, Virgil, Pliny, Livy, Horace, Seneca, Seutonius, Juvenal, and Martial. A good guide to his reading materials can be found throughout his Grand Tour notebooks, BL Add MSS 58313-58320. The most comprehensive list is found at 58320, ff. 63r-92r.
160 The deeper classical links between the Dilettanti and Rome are explored in Bruce Redford, "Grecian taste and Roman spirit': The Society of Dilettanti on classic ground', in Philip Thibodeau and Harry Haskell, eds, *Being there together: Essays in honor of Michael C. J. Putnam on the occasion of his seventieth birthday* (Minnesota, 2003), pp. 258-274.
161 BL Add MS 58321 contains Mitchell's full notebook, exploring *De finibus bonorum et malorum, Questiones Tusculanae, De Nature Deorum, De Divinatione, De Fato, De Legibus, De Officiis, De Senectute,* and *De Amicitia.*
162 Reed Browning, *Political and constitutional ideas of the Court Whigs* (Baton Rouge, Los Angeles and London, 1982), pp. 216-217.
163 *Ibid.*, pp. 175-256.

joy in the pursuit of knowledge was something Mitchell found he could couch in his own understandings of his contemporary environment. From reading *De finibus*, Mitchell noted 'the idea that an excellent man finds virtue and knowledge instinctively pleasurable, and not an end in itself'.[164] Pursuing good, it became clear to Mitchell, was itself a positive act, engaging in learned society, 'doing something, and giving our mind to thought'. Further, pursuing knowledge was not to be a personal gain only: 'When we affirm to do every thing for our own pleasure & convenience', Mitchell argues, 'we can never expect to be trusted by others'.[165] Certainly he could not endure the 'perpetual rest' that Cicero also found so distasteful in learned men.[166]

As noted above, the Dilettanti's prime motivators were not civic virtue, but were actually rather more orientated toward a contemporary version of polite refinement particular to elite men. This accorded with Mitchell's views and with those testimonies of his character which survive today (see, for example, Patrick Murdoch's testimony to Mitchell's character in this chapter). As will be argued below concerning the Royal Society, politeness, civility, and moderated debate could be not only fruitful but encouraged the curiosity so defining of the age.[167] This is not to say that associations with liberty and civic virtue were not widely held, nor that they were indeed held as an authentic conduct of public life.[168] The lack of any impetus for an agenda driven by neither civic virtue nor any distinct republicanism provokes the question as to what exactly Mitchell wanted to gain from this association, and what the association of Dilettanti gained from itself? Even during the aforementioned Calves-Head Club incident involving Dilettanti members, those involved swore that their sole action was to swear oaths of loyalty to crown, country, and ministry.[169] While the ministerial toast might have provoked the crowd, in principle the toast was not disloyal, but rather encouraging of liberty and loyalty. This is not of itself republican nor anti-republican; the lack of a political element to the Dilettanti activities is clear.[170] The polite sociability of the Society was therefore, to a large extent, an end in itself.[171] The fact of their association within an elite male circle was, to a large degree, sanctioned in literature and in public press, the acceptance of their right to do certain things and behave in certain ways enabling them to determine their own fate.[172] The remarkable social change between the

---

164 BL Add MS 58321, f. 3.
165 BL Add MS 58321, ff. 4^{v}-5^{r}.
166 BL Add MS 58321, f. 17; Cicero, *De finibus bonorum et malorum*, trans. H. Rackham (London and Cambridge, MA, 1931) Book V, xx, p. 457.
167 P. Fontes da Costa, 'The culture of curiosity at the Royal Society in the first half of the eighteenth century', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, 56 (2002), pp. 147-166.
168 Ayres notes how Lord Chesterfield, the eminent statesman most famous for his decades of instructive *Letters to his son*, drummed into his son the equation of Rome with contemporary England, and the combination of liberty and civic virtue. See Ayres, *Classical Culture*, p. 13.
169 Kelly, 'Riots, revelries, and rumor', pp. 773-774.
170 This is despite Mitchell's close friend James Thomson penning *Liberty* (1735/36), in which the author identified himself with George Lyttelton's 'Boy Patriots' in opposition to the ministry, 'whom they castigated as a dictator at the head of a corrupt administration.' See Ayres, *Classical culture*, p. 36.
171 In its early years, the society contributed meaningfully to the discussion of the building of a bridge over the Thames, and the founding and conduct of an opera. See Cust, *History*, pp. 42-50.
172 Ayres, *Classical culture*, pp. 16-17.

Restoration period and the mid eighteenth century created the society in which clubs and societies could thrive in diverse social circles, and the public, whether loving or loathing these new social dynamics, were captivated by it.[173] The society, then, secured its own sociability by the mere act of socialising; that is, by eschewing solitude. In turn, agreeableness and a common ground for taste was formed. Thus, when it comes to the Dilettanti, it would be inaccurate to say that Mitchell saw advancement in it in a political sense. Rather, it enabled him to grow, and become more accomplished at those areas which later became his strengths: sociability, civic duty, and the conduct of learned culture.

It is likely that Mitchell identified the common currency of his generation and the men around him: politeness, a philosophy of cultivated society, imbued him with 'the means to understand oneself and one's place in the world'.[174] A strong theme on this front was noted in *The Tatler*, which pointed out that learning without agreeableness, or wisdom without a good nature, was the most undesirable trait in a gentleman. As Lawrence E. Klein notes, 'for its own effectiveness … wisdom required the techniques of sociability'.[175] Without engaging in a semantic debate over the meanings of sociability, sentiment, sentimentality, and politeness (their overarching theme), it is enough to say that the masculine libertinism in which the Dilettanti engaged was a product of its time and many of its ritualistic and alcohol-fuelled ceremonies and dinners attracted little meaningful comment. Dilettanti records show that Andrew Mitchell attended meetings and dinners regularly throughout the 1740s.[176] This is unique to his early career, as his involvement in the Royal Society and the Egyptian Society both demonstrate his dedication to intellectual pursuit in differing ways, as will be shown below. Mitchell's only surviving correspondence with the Dilettanti is a very brief note lamenting his lack of success in soliciting subscribers for the design for an Opera; his dinner and meeting attendances, however, are frequent, and he attended dinners throughout the 1740s, despite his listing in the membership registers as 'abdicated.'[177] His attendance, then, conforms to the ideals of the period: that sociability was seen as a primary engine for learning and the sharing of knowledge;[178] that social clubs could be an intellectual leveller without distinct domestic prejudices or allegiances;[179] and that genuine refinement came through the mutual exchange of personal thoughts.[180] Mitchell's immersion in the Royal

---

[173] John Brewer, *The pleasures of the imagination: English culture in the eighteenth century* (Hammersmith, 1997), pp. 3, 110.
[174] *Ibid.*, p. 101.
[175] Lawrence E. Klein, 'Sociability, solitude, and enthusiasm', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 60 (1997), p. 164.
[176] Mitchell appears in the membership and dinner lists every year from 1739-1748, though he regularly missed between two and four of the society's seasonal gatherings each year.
[177] Andrew Mitchell to the President (at the Star and Garter, Pall Mall), 27 March 1743, *Society of Dilettanti Minutes and Reports of Correspondence*, 1743, f. 49. On the same date Charles Hanbury Williams also wrote to the President apologising for his tardiness in obtaining subscribers, presumably also for the Opera. 'Abdicated' simply meant that a member had received a letter informing them that they had missed six or more meetings while in town; however, those deemed abdicated frequently resumed their association with the society. See Cust, *History*, pp. 39-41.
[178] Klein, 'Sociability', p. 177.
[179] Lawrence E. Klein, 'The figure of France: The politics of sociability in England, 1660-1715', *Yale French Studies*, 92 (1997), pp. 32, 45.
[180] Klein has highlighted the aversion to 'enthusiasm' or outwardly exaggerated shows of personal feeling when it came to sociability and the arts, for example. This is seen differently by Brewer, who in his analysis of sentiment in this age, outlines the dangers of an excess of both refinement and sentiment, which in the contemporary literature

Society and the Egyptian Society still redounded to his interest in that 'amicable collision, friendly interaction', but which maintained and even encouraged, to a greater extent, a 'generality, worldliness, and urbanity.'[181]

The perception of the Royal Society within learned circles was no doubt one of reverence, yet in the early eighteenth century it vied for supremacy with the many other clubs and societies of 1730s London, as well as its more élite French counterpart, the Academy of Sciences, for example. Even in England itself, criticisms existed. Jonathan Swift had mocked the Royal Society in both *A Tale of a Tub*[182] and *Gulliver's Travels*,[183] and Richard Steele used *The Tatler* to make light of the pretensions of the Royal Society to serious study. While natural philosophy was the most 'becoming of a rational creature,' he noted that the 'modern virtuosos' in the Royal Society 'do not much tend to open and enlarge the mind, as to contract and fix it upon trifles…'

> … They seem to be in confederacy against men of polite genius, noble thought, and diffusive learning; and chuse into their assemblies such as have no pretence to wisdom, but want of wit; or to natural knowledge, but ignorance of everything else. I have made observations in this matter so long, that when I meet with a young fellow that is an humble admirer of these sciences, but more dull than the rest of the company, I conclude him to be a fellow of the Royal Society.[184]

This idea of the society has been challenged by Richard Sorrenson. Whatever the level of wit, Sorrenson argues that the society expanded its interest to mixed mathematics, encouraged sociability rigorous debate, and a preference for empirical Newtonianism that spread to the continent.[185] Nevertheless, lengthy presidencies provided stability but also led some to question the innovation of the society. When Mitchell was elected in 1735, Hans Sloane had been in the chair as President eight years, and would not be replaced by Martin Folkes until 1741, and then only due to bad health. Prior to Sloane, Newton had been the

---

was solved through emphasis on the emotional centre of life, the heart. Klein, 'Sociability'; Brewer, *Pleasures of the imagination*, pp. 105, 113-122, 511.

[181] Lawrence E. Klein, 'Liberty, manners, and politeness in early eighteenth-century England', *The Historical Journal*, 32 (1989), p. 602; Lawrence E. Klein, 'Politeness and the interpretation of the British eighteenth century', *The Historical Journal*, 45 (2002), pp. 875-876. These worlds also overlapped. Fellow Scot Alexander Gordon was secretary of both the Society for the Encouragement of Learning and the Egyptian Society. See J. Lempriere, *Universal Biography*, Vol. 1 (New York, 1810), p. 595.

[182] Marcus Walsh, 'Swift's *Tale of a Tub* and the mock book', in Paddy Bullard and James McLaverty, eds, *Jonathan Swift and the eighteenth-century book* (Cambridge, 2013), pp. 107-108.

[183] Roger D. Lund, *Jonathan Swift's Gulliver's Travels: A Routledge study guide* (Abingdon and New York, 2006), pp. 12-13.

[184] The Tatler, 12 October 1710, No. 236 (London, 1794), p. 175.

[185] Richard Sorrenson, 'Towards a history of the Royal Society in the eighteenth century', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, 50 (1996), pp. 29-46.

Society's president for twenty-four years.[186] Mitchell's election in 1735 thus came during a time of shifting priorities for the society, and increased competition from the ever-growing gentlemen's social world of London.[187] Consulting the Royal Society Journal Books, Mitchell's involvement is most intense in the period 1736-1741, after which time, from 1742, he served as Undersecretary for Scotland under the Marquis of Tweeddale. It is easy to assume that Mitchell's government business took up the largest part of his time, and that a move away from direct and regular involvement in the Royal Society is a result of this career move. Yet when Mitchell's involvement is read against his method of acculturation to London life for which this thesis has argued, it becomes clear that Mitchell utilised the Royal Society, as he did the Dilettanti, in part for his social advancement as well as intellectual pursuit. While never a noted scholar in his own right, Mitchell frequently nominated new candidates, and his election to the Council of the Society at the close of 1740 sealed his rise within its ranks.[188]

Mitchell does not seem to have promoted, or partaken in, political faction with the Society. It was to be a general theme of Mitchell's career that he navigated partialities and factions quite smoothly, and he seems to have avoided such entanglements within the Royal Society. Benjamin Franklin, ever sensitive to British politics, considered the society to be apolitical.[189] However, modern historians have recently argued that party politics were present in the society in a number of forms throughout the century. The rise in the politicisation of the society spanned both extremes of this study: in its infancy, the society was intended to support the development of a scientific apparatus that would intimately link with utility for the common man; in the late eighteenth century, criticism of its agenda and the political nature of its operations, particularly under the presidency of Joseph Banks, would undermine its scientific credentials.[190] There seems little doubt that in the late eighteenth century the Royal Society succumbed to both increasing state need for its services, and the increasing scrutiny more generally placed upon the utilisation of science.[191] In fact, as David Miller has pointed out, little is known of the political dynamics of the Royal Society between the end of Isaac Newton's presidency in 1727 and the mantle being taken up by Banks in 1778. Certainly as Miller also notes, there was a 'Hardwicke circle' that involved Martin Folkes – President at the time of Mitchell's participation and a close friend – as well as, at least peripherally, John Pringle and Thomas Birch.

---

186 Charles Richard Weld, *A history of the Royal Society*, Vol. 1 (London, 1848), pp. 475-476; For the Royal Society minutes noting Newton's decease see Royal Society CMO/2/331, 2 March 1727, to which is superscripted Newton's death on 20 March that year.

187 Andrew Mitchell Election Certificate, 27 November 1735, RS EC/1735/18. This is the nomination date, the formal election occurred on 26 February 1735/36.

188 RS CMO/3/88, 11 December 1740.

189 Clark, *British clubs*, p. 181.

190 For a work spanning the entirety of this time period, and into the nineteenth century, see Margaret C. Jacobs and Larry Stewart, *Practical matter: Newton's science in the service of industry and empire, 1687-1851* (Cambridge, MA and London, 2004). Joseph Priestley also complained that by 1790, the Royal Society was riven with faction and 'party spirit'. See Jan Golinski, *Science as public culture: Chemistry and Enlightenment in Britain, 1760-1820* (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 69-70.

191 David Philip Miller, 'The usefulness of natural philosophy: The Royal Society and the culture of practical utility in the later eighteenth century', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, 32 (1999), pp. 185-201; John Gascoigne, 'The Royal Society and the emergence of science as an instrument of state policy', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, 32 (1999), pp. 171-184.

For these reasons, the society, as noted above with Johnson, also had critics of its narrow interests, its lack of public utility, and the bare-faced patronage that supposedly corrupted its leading ranks.

Author Tobias Smollett joined with John Hill in criticising the Royal Society's *Philosophical Transactions* as worthless, particularly in the *Critical Review*.[192] The publication was a platform for Smollett but, curiously, he was also a relation of Andrew Mitchell and indeed willing recipient of Mitchell's patronage.[193] He came to Mitchell's attention through his relative James Smollett of Bonhill, who had written numerous times to Mitchell in Tweeddale's office,[194] and later joined a Scottish milieu in London frequented also by his friend Dr. John Moore.[195] Mitchell appears to have been crucial in securing a better position for Tobias Smollett after the latter left Glasgow, potentially using London connections to secure for Tobias position as surgeon's mate in the Navy.[196] Perhaps it might be understood that Smollett's criticisms of the Royal Society were thus all the more informed. The criticisms by Smollett and others led to perceptions – frequently cited by critics and historians up until David Miller's recent work to disprove this theory – that the Royal Society of the mid-eighteenth century was 'in the doldrums'.[197] Miller, along with Andrea Rusnock, has shown that privileging and judging the society upon its practical output in the mid-eighteenth century is an irrelevant exercise: the various reports coming into the society through live experimentation or correspondence, whether mixed mathematics, astronomy, or even strange medical cases, were not so much 'retrograde' but actually a full ripening of the inclusive and far-reaching organisation of the Royal Society.[198] The argument put forward here is not that Mitchell utilised factional politics to socially advance his career, but that his work within the society, his participation in its ranks and on its council, brought about, by extension and by demonstrable effort, opportunities for a public political career. For it became something of a stage to pursue his interests but also to demonstrate his merits, intellect, and skills to a wider social and political group.

Mitchell made a substantial contribution to the nominations of new Royal Society members. It demonstrated his concern to expand his own intellectual horizons and those of the Society, but also was a demonstration of his cosmopolitanism. By mid-century, the scientific leaps taken by the Society in earlier decades were bemoaned as having lost their impetus, but the election nominees put forward by Mitchell

---

[192] David Philip Miller, 'The 'Hardwick Circle': The Whig supremacy and its demise in the 18th century Royal Society', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, 52 (1998), pp. 73-91.
[193] Robert Crawford, *Devolving English literature* (Oxford, 1992), pp. 56-57; Richard J. Jones, *Tobias Smollett in the Enlightenment: Travels through France, Italy, and Scotland* (Lewisburg, 2011), p. 170n40; Kenneth Simpson, 'Tobias Smollett', *ODNB*, at doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/25947, accessed 14 May 2018. Mitchell was the cousin of James Smollett. Tobias Smollett is variously referred to as Mitchell's cousin, or as James Smollett's cousin, which would make him Mitchell's second cousin.
[194] *Quarterly Review*, Vol. 103 (London, 1858), p. 74.
[195] Henry L. Fulton, *Dr. John Moore, 1729-1802: A life in medicine, travel, and revolution* (Newark, 2015), p. 82.
[196] Robert Chambers, *Smollett: his life and a selection from his writings* (London and Edinburgh, 1867), pp. 39-40; Lewis Mansfield Knapp, *Tobias Smollett: Doctor of men and manners* (Princeton, 1949), pp. 27-28.
[197] David P. Miller, "Into the valley of darkness: Reflections on the Royal Society in the eighteenth century', *History of Science,* 27 (1989), p. 156.
[198] Miller, 'Into the valley of darkness', p. 157; Andrea Rusnock, 'Correspondence networks and the Royal Society, 1700-1750', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, 32 (1999), pp. 155-169.

and others show a constant attempt to expand the knowledge networks of the Society. Though Samuel Johnson claimed to speak for many when he belittled the Society's interests as lacking any public utility, Mitchell, in particular, is frequently associated with continental elections to the society.[199] Considering Johnson's criticism, Mitchell's work to enlarge the correspondence links of the society can be seen as an awareness that criticisms of this kind existed. Of Mitchell's thirty-one signed nominations to the Royal Society, nineteen were for members originating from or residing in continental Europe (Table 1). Foreign members, as Rusnock explains, 'relied on personal knowledge to establish their trustworthiness as correspondents', and by vouching for their intellectual as well as personal strengths, Mitchell was actively performing this role.[200] Mitchell had a concerned for the growth of the society's more cosmopolitan elements. An analysis of his nominations might shed more light on his conceptions of the Society and its role.

There is evidence for Mitchell being on personal terms with many of his nominations, though not all. George Lewis Scott and Hugh Smithson were both friends of Mitchell, the former in the close circle of Thomson and the latter joining with Mitchell in the Society for the Encouragement of Learning.[201] Francesco Algarotti is one Mitchell had met in Paris on his Grand Tour, while Andrew Cantwell, and possibly the Marquis de Saint Hillaire were people Mitchell met in Montpellier on his Grand Tour. Mitchell probably met Dr. Herman Bernard in person, a physician who, while coming from Prussia, was a practising physician in London by the 1760s.[202] On his Grand Tour Mitchell attended a meeting of the Institute of Bologna, where Eustachio Zanotti 'secretary to the Institute read a discourse of his in Latin containing reflections upon some new books'.[203] Mitchell knew Frederick Lewis (Louis) Norden from the Egyptian Society,[204] and Jerome de Salis Mitchell knew from the Society for the Encouragement of Learning. Francis Philip Duval Mitchell would have known from London society and as a friend of George Lewis Scott.[205] Ralph Knight we have no information on, but the London-based physician William Battie would possibly have been known to Mitchell. We do not know precisely when Mitchell met Richard Pococke, but they were both members of the Egyptian Society from 1741, and had possibly met on the Grand Tour. Pococke later recalled dining with 'my friend Mr. Mitchel [sic], member for Aberdeen and secretary under the Marquise of Twidale [sic]' in Edinburgh in 1747 when Mitchell had just been elected to Parliament for

---

[199] See Johnson's polemics on self-centred intellectual academies in general, and the Royal Society in particular, examined thoroughly in J. R. Philip, 'Samuel Johnson as antiscientist', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, 29 (1975), pp. 193-203.
[200] Rusnock, 'Correspondence networks', p. 160.
[201] William Jerdan, *Illustrations of the plan of a National Association for the Encouragement and Protection of Authors, and men of talent and genius* (London, 1839), p. 7.
[202] William Minet, *Some account of the Huguenot family of Minet from their coming out of France at the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes MDCLXXXVI. Founded on Isaac Minet's 'Relation of our familly' [sic]* (London, 1892), p. 215. Mr William Minet of London left to 'my good friend, a most able and skilful physician who has practised physic in the most successful humane and honorable [sic] way Dr Herman Bernard of London'.
[203] Mitchell Grand Tour Diary, BL Add MS 58316, f. 40^{v}.
[204] Minute Book of the Egyptian Society, BL Add MS 52362, f. 3, where Norden's motto is *nec timide nec temere*, a reverse of the Latin phrase, *nec temere nec timide*, which means 'neither rashly nor timidly'.
[205] Scott and Duval were the executors of Abraham de Moivre's will. See Bellhouse, *Abraham de Moivre*, p. 211.

Aberdeenshire.[206] Jeremiah Milles was also known to Mitchell from the Egyptian Society, where he became the leader or 'Reis Effendi'. Milles had travelled with Pococke on the Grand Tour. The nomination for the Marquis of Locmaria states that he is 'personally known' to his nominators, though he may have been associated with the Jacobites in Italy at a later time.[207]

Mitchell would have personally met Ulloa, who was taken to Britain as a prisoner after exploring and making scientific discoveries in South America. Antonio Nicolini, Marchese di Ponsacco visited London at the time of his nomination and so would have personally met Mitchell, as would Falco Rinuccini, who seems have accompanied Nicolini to London. Mitchell's final nominations were for fellow Scots John Blair, resident in London, John Gregory, and William Graeme. Mitchell's final nomination, William Hamilton, British Envoy Extraordinary to Naples, was probably not personally known to Mitchell as the latter was not returned from Prussia when Hamilton left for Naples.

Others probably came through recommendations from friends or fellow Society members. Philip Naudé, Antonio Francesco Gori, and others could have come in this way. Gori was a well known antiquarian scholar, as his election certificate states.[208] Buffon initially made his name in mathematics, upon which his Society nomination is based, but while Buffon was in Paris when Mitchell visited on his Grand Tour, there is no record of them meeting. The nominations of Sachetti and Giacomelli were probably favours to Algarotti, who also signed both these nominations. We cannot be sure that Mitchell met the Hanoverian minister Hardenberg, though his nomination certificate states that 'upon our personal knowledge [we] recommend him'.[209] Neither did Mitchell seem to have ever met Louis de Beaufort, whose *A Dissertation upon the Uncertainty of the Roman History during the First Five hundred Years* was published in London in 1740, and would have been of interest to Mitchell and others.[210] Ernst Christoph Manteuffel, a Polish nobleman, is not known to have visited England in order to join. Concerned not only with the ability of the society to collect information from sources abroad as well as domestically, one of Mitchell's activities on the council was to support intellectuals of lesser means, such as Maclaurin and Benjamin Robins.

Johnson's critique had hit a sore point with those in the society: that its pursuit of intellectual advancement had not taken with it the very people and societies that most required its expertise. Mitchell best demonstrated the Janus face of the learned societies with which he was involved by first supporting mathematician Benjamin Robins' standing within the Royal Society, and secondly, by demonstrating the equality of his intellectual ambitions with his political ambitions by attempting an audacious Royal Society

---

[206] Richard Pococke, *Tours in Scotland, 1747, 1750, 1760*, ed. Daniel William Kemp, *Publications of the Scottish History Society*, Vol. 1 (1887, no place of publication), p. 3.
[207] Martha Keith Schuchard, *Emanuel Swedenborg, secret agent on Earth and in Heaven: Jacobites, Jews and Freemasons in early modern Sweden* (Leiden and Boston, 2012), p. 244.
[208] A contemporary Grand Tour diary notes Gori's work on painting. See Thomas Nugent, *The Grand Tour, or, a journey through the Netherlands, Germany, Italy and France*, 2nd ed (London 1756), p. 409.
[209] Royal Society Election Certificate, Friedrich August von Hardenberg, RS EC/1745/07.
[210] Louis de Beaufort, *A Dissertation upon the Uncertainty of the Roman History during the First Five hundred Years*, Part 1 (London, 1740).

dinner surprise. One was intellectual, the other sociable entertainment designed with advancement in mind. These two points represent the political and the social, under which ebbed the intellectual dynamics of relations that defined Mitchell's career. They also demonstrate that Mitchell, like his society counterparts, could be apolitical when they needed to be. When Benjamin Robins, Newtonian mathematician and military engineer, had fallen behind in his dues to the Royal Society, it was Andrew Mitchell, in a council meeting of 30 November 1741, who moved a motion for an exemption of all dues for Robins. Mitchell moved that Robins be excused and 'some favourable indulgence be allowed him … in consideration of the bent of his Studies, which are more for the promotion of Knowledge than Profit'.[211]

Mitchell's stance here marks two points. First, his support of Robins for the benefits of his work to the general fund of knowledge is important. It echoes Mitchell's work in the Society for the Encouragement of Learning and his promotion of the important mathematical contributions of Colin Maclaurin, himself less than advantageously positioned when it came to income.[212] Secondly, it is important to note that Mitchell supported Robins in full knowledge of the latter's previous work in the political realm, and the important role Robins played in the downfall of Robert Walpole and his ministry.[213] Robins had been a main proponent of the 'patriot' opposition against Walpole, and had been Secretary of a House of Commons committee 'appointed to examine into [Walpole's] past conduct'.[214] It is because of this political zeal that Robins missed out on a position at Greenwich military college, and highly probable that this is the reason Mitchell stepped in for him. Taken together with Mitchell's support of Newtonian applications of mathematics, and more general intellectual studies, his support for Robins was possibly calculated to mark a small but important political position within the Royal Society but also to more clearly shape the view that his peers took of him.

There is a second example of Mitchell's ambition to advance within the Royal Society, and within the social milieu of its membership. The following example is somewhat of a contradiction of Mitchell's character in terms of the perspicuity of his actions and the rather understated nature of his conduct. What it does show, however, is the elements of Mitchell's actions that accord more with acts of public social advancement than his own rational standards. Frequent Royal Society dinners formed an opportunity for members to relieve themselves of the constraints of running a large and cumbersome intellectual organisation. It was declared, at a dinner of the Royal Society on May 3, 1750, that any fellow 'complimenting this company annually with a haunch of venison shall during the continuance of such annuity be esteemed an honorary member & admitted as often as he comes without paying the fine which

---

211 RS CMO/3/94, Minutes of a meeting of the Council of the Royal Society, 30 November 1741.
212 Mitchell promoted Maclaurin's work within the Royal Society, and facilitated publications of Maclaurin's groundbreaking work on fluxions and curved lines. See RS EL/M3/51a, a list of errata in Maclaurin's paper in the *Philosophical Transactions*, sent by Mitchell to John Machin in 1737.
213 Brett D. Steele, 'Robins, Benjamin (1707-1751)', *ODNB*, at www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23823, accessed 11 July 2017. Robins' links to Leonhard Euler and Francis Hauksbee, and how this links to the intellectual ambition of Andrew Mitchell, will be explored later in the thesis.
214 James Wilson, 'Preface' in *Mathematical tracts of the late Benjamin Robins, esq.*, Vol. 1 (London, 1761), p. xxvii.

those members do who are elected by ballot'.[215] While not present at this meeting, Mitchell surely heard of the promise of esteem that this would afford a gentleman of means and ambition. A haunch of venison, its butchery, and carriage to the dinner, could cost around £1 and 15 shillings, but for men of means, this was not such an extension of their finances. Why it did not happen more often is a subject for another paper. Perhaps, as William Smyth has argued, the trend was most prevalent among non-regular members, potentially as a way to win entry back into the regular membership of the society.[216] But when it did occur, as with Mitchell's friend and fellow diplomat Charles Hanbury Williams in 1751, the rewards were substantial: a toast from the whole dinner party, consumed in claret, and of course honorary membership exempt from the annual member's fee.[217] In 1750, however, when the venison edict was issued, Mitchell did not react. It was not until 4 October 1750 that the society increased the stakes, on Mitchell's promise to deliver a turtle to the Society's next dinner, from the West Indies no less. The decree on Mitchell's announcement was that the delivery of a turtle would secure honorary membership just as Williams' chine of beef had earlier in the year.[218] Putting these strands together, it is unlikely that Mitchell justified the expense and ambition of this act in terms of entertainment value. Rather, the act of importing a turtle from the West Indies speaks to his ambition within the society, underpinned by his many nominations for fellows and previous support of Benjamin Robins. A week after Mitchell's announcement, news was delivered that the turtle had died coming up the channel, but the very act of Mitchell's attempt confirms his ambition as seen in social terms.[219]

Masculine association could and did spill over into entertainment, and this was but a partial focus for Andrew Mitchell. His involvement in the Egyptian Society – though he never fulfilled one of the society's core rules in having visited Egypt – as Treasurer further situates Mitchell in an ambitious and gregarious society of gentlemen, treasuring both the enhancement of knowledge but also the enjoyment of it. Antiquarianism in the form of the study of ancient Egypt and the Levant was seen as congruous with the ambitions of science in general, and was seen as a natural accompaniment to more contemporary scientific interests.[220] Mitchell's communication with, and membership of, the infant Edinburgh

---

[215] RS RSC1/1 1748-1751, 3 May 1750.
[216] William Henry Smyth, *Sketch of the Rise and Progress of the Royal Society Club* (London, 1860), pp. 20, 22. Smyth also notes that the practice was stamped out on 29 July 1779. See Smyth, p. 22.
[217] RS RSC1/1 1748-1751, 27 June 1751; on this occasion the secretary does not list Williams' health being drunk, because although he delivered what the society considered an acceptable trade-off, it was not at the quality and quantity required to receive a toast, but this was the custom and was frequently put into force. See Smyth, *Sketch*, pp. 20-21.
[218] RS RSC1/1 1748-1751, 4 October 1750, also at a meeting of the society where Mitchell attended with his close friend, the physician John Pringle. See RS Meeting Minutes, RSC1/1 1748-1751, f. 12. Mitchell had perhaps let his annual Society dues slip in the 1740s and into the 1750s, and is listed numerously as a visitor to meetings and dinners. See, for example, RS RSC 1/1 1748-1751, 1 June 1749, 28 September 1749, 9 May 1751. A chine of beef was at that moment calculated in terms of its proportion of a haunch of venison, or its equivalency to a turtle following on from Mitchell.
[219] RS RSC 1/1, 12 October 1750. A turtle was successfully delivered by Lord Anson on 5 September 1754, and another 'mighty chine of beef' and 'three brace of very large carp' by Williams in 1755, for which it was noted that his arrears were eradicated. See Smyth, *Sketch*, p. 22.
[220] Miller, 'Into the valley of darkness', p. 160.

Philosophical Society was a precursor to his later roles as a correspondent and facilitator of knowledge. For the Edinburgh Society, Mitchell facilitated the shipping of Francis Hauksbee's 'digester', a vessel that boiled at high pressure, thereby increasing its temperature.[221] Mitchell's membership of this learned society fits into the interpretation made by R. L. Emerson that the society, although formulated by a group of Scottish learned men interested in astronomy, sought to include in its formulation men of high social status. The reason for this seems to have been to ensure the society maintained an equal distribution of academics, doctors, and learned men with an interest in perpetuating and transferring knowledge.[222]

Mitchell's Egyptian Society membership, however brief, was a further contribution to his involvement in the learned social milieu of his early years in London, which included men of learning but also, vitally, men of political means and strong social standing. His motto as 'Haznadar', or Treasurer of the Egyptian Society, was drawn from Cicero and represented a playful disdain for pecuniary worth when it came to social and intellectual ambition. It was probably here that he met men whom he would later nominate to the Royal Society, such as Richard Pococke, Jeremiah Milles, and Frederick Norden and where he surely honed his interests in line with those of the eminent men with whom he met: Charles Stanhope, William Stukeley, the dukes of Montagu and Richmond, and the earl of Sandwich.[223]

Mitchell's close friend Patrick Murdoch perhaps stated Mitchell's ambition rather simply, when he wrote to Colin Maclaurin that 'Mitchell… grows every day in the Esteem of all that know him'.[224] Perhaps, for this intense period of growth in his social and intellectual life, this was the most tangible benefit of Mitchell's tireless socialising. It would lead to a lengthy and complicated career in politics and diplomacy.

v. Conclusion

This chapter has argued that Andrew Mitchell utilised patronage – both literary and scientific – to achieve a certain level of social standing upon his entry into London society in the early 1730s, and after his Grand

---

221 Maclaurin to Mitchell, 3 December 1743, in Mills, ed, *Collected letters*, pp. 116-117. The absence of the 'digester', which had still not arrived by March 1744, caused Maclaurin and the Edinburgh Philosophical Society some anxiety, but it was not due to Mitchell's actions in helping to acquire it. See Maclaurin to the Earl of Morton, 27 March 1744, in Mills, ed, *Collected letters*, pp. 401-404.

222 Mitchell joined some time around 1742, five years or so after the society's founding. See R. L. Emerson, 'The philosophical society of Edinburgh, 1737-1747', pp. 162, 190. Mitchell also facilitated Martin Folkes' membership of the society. Maclaurin to Mitchell, 6 January 1742/3, in Mills, ed, *Collected letters*, pp. 93-94; Maclaurin to the Earl of Morton, 8 January 1743, in Mills, ed, *Collected letters*, p. 96.

223 BL Add MS 52362, Journal of the Egyptian Society, where the opening folios, unnumbered, outline the earliest members and their ranks within the society. The motto, slightly altered, is drawn from Cicero's *De Officiis,* Book 1. Mitchell's version is 'nihil honestius magnificentiusque quam pecuniam contemnere, si habeas', translating to 'nothing is more noble and more honourable than to despise riches, if you have them.' The original quotation in Cicero is 'nihil honestius magnificentiusque quam pecuniam contemnere, si non habeas, si habeas...'. See William Johnson, ed, *The Offices of Cicero* (London, 1828), p. 52.

224 Patrick Murdoch to Colin Maclaurin, 23 March 1741, in Mills, ed, *Collected letters*, pp. 346-347.

Tour in the mid 1730s. It has been asserted that Mitchell became involved in intellectual and learned pursuits to increase his social and intellectual friendships, and to selflessly improve the careers and lives of those people he befriended. A line of career ambition runs through Mitchell's social world and his various interests, which have been outlined. Promotion of the work of Colin Maclaurin and James Thomson, for example, allowed him to expand his influence but also his reputation for facilitating sound scholarship and literature. The social groups in which he participated – the Society of Dilettanti and the Egyptian Society – demonstrate a willingness to indulge in masculine libertinism to a certain degree, which directly or indirectly benefited Mitchell's career in the short and long term. Mitchell's activities during his membership of the more formal Royal Society and Edinburgh Philosophical Society demonstrate an ambition to broaden the social network of London intellectual life, and diversify the pool of information from which intellects within the Royal Society could draw. His selfless interest in the Society for the Encouragement of Learning, though it proved unable to change the direction of literary production in eighteenth century England, is noteworthy insofar as it has enhanced scholarly knowledge of the ambitions of one man within a greater and loftier social milieu. In sum, Mitchell did not separate politics from social life, or masculine libertinism from the pursuit of genuine intellectual discovery. As Jason Kelly noted in his work on the Dilettanti, Mitchell and the men in his circle saw no real distinction between those ideas, and indeed they overlapped to a significant degree in Mitchell's subsequent career.[225]

[225] Kelly, 'Riots, revelries, and rumor, p. 778.

Chapter 3

The Politics of a Scot in London

i. Introduction

Andrew Mitchell's university life has been briefly outlined in Chapter 1. When studying at Edinburgh University in the 1720s, he was exposed to the traditional teaching of law, but more importantly, to the new method of teaching history as espoused by the University's first Professor of Universal History, Charles Mackie. In turn, when he left Edinburgh to pursue further studies at Leiden, Mitchell travelled with George Turnbull, a philosopher and clergyman whose teaching at Marischal College, Aberdeen, placed him in the 'phalanx of young, innovative' teachers in Aberdeen in the early 1720s, which included Colin Maclaurin.[1] It seems highly likely that Turnbull's trip to the Netherlands with Mitchell and another, Andrew Wauchope of Niddrie, served a dual purpose of updating Turnbull on philosophy and law, and also working as a travelling tutor to both Mitchell and Wauchope of Niddrie. Both Mackie and Turnbull were involved in Mitchell's life at the same time. Mackie was his teacher, his friend, and later, his correspondent. Turnbull was a friend and correspondent and, later, a travelling tutor to Mitchell. They all shared a common participation in the Rankenian Club, the details of Mitchell's role in which is outlined in Chapter 2 of this thesis. Both Mackie and Turnbull also held strong views about the teaching of students at Edinburgh and in Scotland more generally, and wrote extensively on these views in order to expand the impact of their teachings on students. These teachings impacted Mitchell in several ways: it inculcated in him a strong sceptical approach to intellectual authorities; it created in him an ability to debate on the most topical publications and ideas of the day, drawing from ancient and modern authors; and it gave him a specific political and historical outlook that had a strong impact on the way in which his political career would progress, certainly at least in the early years before the circumstances of contemporary politics changed.

Chapter 2 situated Andrew Mitchell in the social and intellectual networks of mid-eighteenth-century London. It explored his social world and argued that he utilised this world for both pleasure and social advancement. This chapter will explore the political side of the same time period, during which Mitchell was adopted by powerful Whigs including the Dukes of Richmond and Montagu, and the Earl of Chesterfield. For a young Scot on his first trip to London, this is a remarkable social feat and one that deserves closer scrutiny. With this in mind, the key questions of this chapter are: in what ways did Mitchell forge political associations and why were people drawn to him? How did he gain the Duke of Newcastle's political trust? What can be gleaned from Mitchell's time in Parliament, and what does this tell the historian

[1] Stewart and Wood, 'Introduction', p. xi.

about Mitchell's position, and that of Scottish gentlemen, in the first half of the eighteenth century in Britain?

ii. Scottish migration to London and 'Scotophobia'

Mitchell's move to London needs to be discussed in detail. Before this can be done, we must provide the context for his arrival there. It is important to be reminded of the less than welcome setting that London provided for job- or career-seeking Scots at this time. How a Scot such as Mitchell, and in fact many Scots, came to be successful in this climate helps us to conceptualise and argue for Mitchell's place in that world, and his advancement.

Scots had clearly demonstrated their adaptability as well as their cultural orientation toward Europe rather than England. As T. C. Smout has written, 'more than England, Scotland was a European country, more at ease in, and less suspicious of, other cultures'.[2] Far from insular, Scots adapted to travel in order to seek success and security, and prided themselves on well developed pan-European networks.[3] So what was different about Scots arriving in eighteenth-century London? In eighteenth-century London, political union between England and Scotland meant an inseparable link had been formed which necessitated co-mingling on a scale not seen before. As Linda Colley argues, collective patronage now strengthened what had been traditional migratory practices.[4]

Scotland's union with England was rationalised on a number of fronts, most prominently religion and politics. In terms of its political associations, Scotland's union with England had the effect of strengthening the latter's 'Whig supremacy', consolidated after the last of Queen Anne's Tory ministries, and which came to dominate British politics for the next few decades first under Lord Stanhope and then the long reign of Robert Walpole. Scotland, 'the native land of Whiggery', reinforced the Protestant House of Hanover and helped to settle Britain's commitment to war against France. The staunch Protestantism of Scotland's Kirk assisted in the maintenance of England's Glorious Revolution settlement, while also providing a strong buffer against Jacobites and their French supporters.[5] Moreover, English concessions for the Church of Scotland and a promise to uphold its status were, in part, a way that England could secure Scottish political support. One of the strongest voices was that of William Castares, Principal of Edinburgh University, who told Queen Anne's minister Robert Harley that 'the desire I have to see our Church secured

---

[2] T. C. Smout, 'The culture of migration: Scots as Europeans, 1500-1800', *History Workshop Journal*, 40 (1995), pp. 108, 116.
[3] T. M. Devine, *The Scottish nation 1700-2000* (London, 1999), p. 27.
[4] Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the nation 1707-1837*, rev. ed. (New Haven and London, 2009), p. 124.
[5] Jeremy Black has argued that international politics had a stronger impact on British domestic politics than some have allowed for. See Jeremy Black, 'Introduction: An age of political stability?' in Jeremy Black, ed, *Britain in the age of Walpole* (Houndmills and London, 1984), p. 4.

makes me in love with the Union as the most probable means to preserve it'.[6] Walpole's government management, which extended to careful pressure on the structure of bishoprics and their votes, was enhanced by Scotland's loyal Whigs.[7] The death of Queen Anne had only more firmly entrenched the Whigs in their belief in the upholding of the Glorious Revolution's settlement of church and state.[8] While the term 'Whig' itself evolved over time, 'Whiggism' had what H. T. Dickinson has called 'a fairly coherent body of attitudes, prejudices and principles', and while it had its limitations in terms of coherency, Whiggism gave to its adherents 'a set of normative values by which to judge the political and social order'.[9]

Chapter 2 sought to show how Mitchell integrated into a social world that was based on intellectualism, and masculine libertinism. It also examined a small portion of the Scottish milieu in London. Its goal, however, was not to account for the dynamics of Anglo-Scottish, or British, politics, but to examine Mitchell's place in the intellectual world of London. He quickly flowered in numerous societies and in numerous social circles, and this aptitude for cultivating friendships was a key basis for the growth of his reputation. The London into which Mitchell entered in the late 1720s was the centre of a debate over the involvement (and its extent) of Scots in the English political and cultural world. While Daniel Defoe expended much energy and ink trying to bring together Scotland and England before the Union, he could not entirely hide the fears and anxieties both sides held about what impact Union would have on politics and culture.[10] It appears, however, that fears were greatly heightened on the side of the English and that 'Scotophobia', or the phenomenon of fear of Scottish influence on English life, was a reaction to Union and its many implications. It created a figure of resentment in the form of the migrating or 'travelling' Scot, a figure which historians have variously sought to downplay or to bring to light.

Gordon Pentland has argued that visual representations of Scots in English print culture were minimal, and that there was little to stimulate printmakers to force Scots into the English public consciousness, in the pre-1745 period. Post-1745 and the second Jacobite rising, however, portrayals of Scots as disloyal, dirty, and scheming people are rife and were intense elements of Scotophobia well past the period of the Earl of Bute's leadership, which lasted until 1762.[11] Similarly, Linda Colley sees Scotophobia as a reaction to the disloyalty shown in the Jacobite rising, and although only a small minority of Scotland supported the return of the Stuart dynasty, Scotophobic prints and literature sought to differentiate between English and Scots and to create a divide in the growing national unity.[12]

---

[6] Cited in Bruce Lenman, 'A client society: Scotland between the '15 and the '45' in Black, ed, *Britain in the Age of Walpole*, p. 71.
[7] Brian Hill, 'Parliament, parties and elections (1688-1760)', in H. T. Dickinson, ed, *A companion to eighteenth-century Britain* (Malden and Oxford, 2002), pp. 61-64.
[8] Basil Williams, *The Whig supremacy 1714-1760*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1962), p. 150.
[9] H. T. Dickinson, 'Whiggism in the eighteenth century', in John Cannon, ed, *The Whig ascendancy: Colloquies on Hanoverian England* (London, 1981), p. 29.
[10] Rivka Swenson, *Essential Scots and the idea of unionism in Anglo-Scottish literature, 1603-1832* (Lewisburg, 2016), p. 28.
[11] Gordon Pentland, "We Speak for the Ready': Images of Scots in political prints, 1707-1832', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 90 (2011), pp. 68, 71-72.
[12] Colley, *Britons*, pp. 117-118.

Nevertheless, the durability of the Scot and his willingness to travel for work and opportunities has been noted by recent scholars in relation to English anxieties over Scots in their country.[13] Daniel Defoe, a supposed champion of Scottish inclusion in England and a post-1707 Britain, was not afraid of likening Scots to Egyptian locusts:

> Scots from the northern frozen banks of Tay,
>
> With packs and plods came whigging all away:
>
> Thick as the locusts which in Egypt swarmed
>
> With pride and hungry hopes completely arm'd;
>
> With native truth, diseases, and no money
>
> Plundered our Canaan of the milk and honey.[14]

Defoe's jibes were bookended in the seventeenth, late eighteenth and even early nineteenth centuries by the idea of the 'Scotch louse' and the filthy Scotchman. A collection of songs spanning the middle of the seventeenth century in Britain noted the many problems facing the 'Common Weal', one of which is 'a great *Scotch* Louse'.[15] These books, for example, contained veiled or open references to diseased and lice-ridden, irrational, and unclean Scots, who ate 'Scotch chocolate' which they defined as 'brimstone and milk'.[16] More than their supposed uncleanliness and vagrancy, was the idea that Scots were bringing this diseased and destabilising society to England. Well-known anecdotes depicted the Scottish louse travelling southward,[17] like 'Swarms of Locusts'[18] flouting the laws and customs of England,[19] with their 'Caledonian poison'[20] failing to respect English culture or assimilate properly.[21]

---

[13] Smout, 'Culture of migration', p. 116; Swenson, *Essential Scots*, pp. 4-5.
[14] Daniel Defoe, *The True-Born Englishman* (London, 1701), p. 24.
[15] *Rump: Or an Exact Collection of the Choycest Poems and Songs Relating to the Late Times. By The Most Eminent Wits, From* Anno *1639 to* Anno *1661* (London, 1662), pp. 160-165.
[16] Pierce Egan, *Grose's Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue* (London, 1823), no pagination.
[17] *Sir John Fielding's Jests, or New Fun for the Parlour and the Kitchen* (London, 1781), p. 68. The 1810 print is entitled 'A Compass at Sea, or the Use of a Scotch Louse' (1810).
[18] Rivka Swenson, 'Revising the Scottish plot in Tobias Smollett's *Roderick Random*', in Christopher D. Johnson, ed, *New contexts for Eighteenth-Century British fiction: 'Hearts Resolved and Hands Prepared'. Essays in Honor of Jerry C. Beasley* (Lanham, 2011), p. 182.
[19] *An Address to the College of Physicians, and to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge; Occasion'd by the late Swarms of Scotch and Leyden Physicians etc.* (London, 1747).
[20] *The British Antidote to Caledonian Poison: Consisting of the most humorous Satirical Political Prints, for the Year 1762*, 5th ed. (London, 1763); this volume was supplemented in 1765 by *The Scots Scourge: Being A Compleat Supplement to the British Antidote to the* Caledonian Poison, 2 Vols., Vol. 1, 6th ed. (London, 1765).
[21] Pentland, 'We Speak for the Ready', pp. 83-84.

James Boswell, himself a man who struggled with a dual identity of Scotsman and would-be Englishman, loathed the first generation of London-based, post-Union Scots who he thought were living a false identity, or as one author has called them, 'mutton dressed as lamb'.[22] Boswell embodied the conflict some may have felt, which was a conflict of the will to succeed in assimilating into English culture, but retaining a bond to Scotland. Boswell felt that men like the playwright David Mallet, for example, had lost those elements of Scotland that made them who they truly were.[23]

Yet the first post-Union Scottish generation, like Mitchell and Boswell's father Alexander, did not blindly wander the English cultural and political scene. They were aware of their cultural difference and the different lifestyle in London, and some fought to retain their distance from English attitudes. In Mitchell's case he cultivated English manners and sensibilities while maintaining his Scottish connection through his social circles and politics. David Hume once noted that 'some hate me because I am not a Whig, some because I am not a Christian, and all because I am a Scotchman'.[24] Scots saw themselves, in part, as maintaining a 'North British' identity, communing with England but upholding their own cultural values and networks. In other words, according to Colin Kidd, 'Britishness, couched in predominantly English terms, was, in effect, tantamount to Anglo-Britishness'. Therefore, Kidd writes, 'North Britons' could adopt an English political identity but shun Anglocentrism.[25] David Mallet, born with the more Scottish name of Malloch and one of the most successful early Scottish migrants to London in the eighteenth century, did by his work and his reputation deconstruct the English perception of Scottish inferiority, at least in literature and theatre.[26] James Boswell's father Alexander best expressed the views of many first generation Scots in London toward that city, and England in general. Alexander loathed his son's wish:

> To live in dependence upon Strangers in another Country where you have nothing to expect but fair words. They [the London English] have their relations to provide, their political connections to keep up and must look on one who comes from Scotland as an idle person to have no right to Share of their Country, in the same way that we here would never think of

[22] James J. Caudle, 'James Boswell (*H. Scoticus Londoniensis*)' in Stana Nenadic, ed, *Scots in London in the Eighteenth Century* (Lewisburg, 2010), p. 110.
[23] *Ibid.*, pp. 110-111. This perhaps says more about Boswell's own struggles over cultural identity than it does about those first-generation Scots he loathed, for the latter made clear progress while Boswell was to remain largely conflicted over his identity, particularly in the company of Samuel Johnson, who was not wholly friendly to Scots and Scotland. It is also interesting to note that Boswell visited Mitchell in Berlin only a year after recording these remarks. He noted none of these sentiments on meeting Mitchell, who was an old friend of his father, but it is unknown whether he did not remark on this out of respect or whether he did not include Mitchell in these sentiments.
[24] Devine, *The Scottish nation*, p. 28.
[25] Colin Kidd, 'North Britishness and the nature of eighteenth-century British patriotisms', *The Historical Journal*, 39 (1996), pp. 363-364, 377.
[26] Sandro Jung, "Staging' an Anglo-Scottish identity: The early career of David Mallet, poet and playwright in London', in Nenadic, ed, *Scots in London*, p. 73.

> bestowing anything upon a vagueing Englishman [who had come to Edinburgh] Except a Dinner or a Supper.[27]

The more middling and higher profile Scottish migrants to London, then, retained a sense of their Scottish roots by association if not in practice, and Anita Guerrini notes that 'ambition and money overtook religion and ideology as motives for migration'.[28] I noted this above in regard to Mitchell, who could not be expected to forgo his Scottish nature when his political position centred around its existence. Using the example of Tobias Smollett, Juliet Shields argues that Scots adopted 'English values and manners' but maintained a claim to 'Scotland's empowerment' in a lop-sided political system.[29] As T. M. Devine has pointed out, the nobility, intellectuals, and merchants were not willing to give up all they had gained by a union with England, and so tolerated the treatment they were often meted out as Scots.[30] Scotophobia, as Nenadic has argued, did not stop Scots 'trying their luck in the capital', and like Shields, Nenadic shows that adaptation of language, manners and dress were key to success.[31] The mastery of the language, like their political and social acculturation to England, was a process that, to some degree, allowed them to identify more strongly with the nascent idea of Britain.[32] As John Stuart Shaw argues, nobles and elites like Argyll, and his brother Ilay, thrived in the political world of London because they were the foci of patronage and interest, as opposed to British politics more generally which saw much power in the hands of the House of Commons.[33] This is not to downplay the dynamics of Anglo-Scottish political relations in the post-Union years, which were still beholden to political and social interests.

One of the ways in which Mitchell set his career moving was by studying and qualifying for the English bar upon moving to the capital permanently in 1735. The classic professions of England – divinity, physic, and law – were still highly prominent in the eighteenth century and maintained their rather elite aura.[34] As Penelope Corfield has noted, knowledge was the key to this, although 'great intelligence was not obligatory, and excessive 'cleverness' could become suspect'.[35] The separate world of these professions, and their access to exclusive knowledge and shared interests, was as much inclusive as it was exclusive. Once admitted to this milieu, a man like Andrew Mitchell, for example, could socialise with any number of men who had access to power. Andrew Mitchell lodged at the Middle Temple from 1734, was articled to

---

[27] Alexander Boswell [Lord Auchinleck] to James Boswell, 30 May 1763, cf. Caudle, 'James Boswell', p. 114.
[28] Anita Guerrini, 'Scots in London medicine in the early eighteenth century', in Nenadic, ed, *Scots in London*, p. 181.
[29] Juliet Shields, 'Smollett's Scots and sodomites: British masculinity in *Roderick Random*', *The Eighteenth Century*, 46 (2005), pp. 175-176, 182.
[30] Devine, *The Scottish nation*, p. 28.
[31] Stana Nenadic, 'Introduction', in Nenadic, ed, *Scots in London*, pp. 19, 21-23.
[32] Janet Sorensen, *The grammar of empire in eighteenth-century British writing* (Cambridge, 2000), p. 138.
[33] John Stuart Shaw, *The political history of eighteenth-century Scotland* (Houndmills and London, 1999), pp. 29-31.
[34] Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language*, 8th ed., Vol. 2 (London, 1799), no pp.
[35] Penelope J. Corfield, *Power and the professions in Britain 1700-1850* (London and New York, 1995), p. 20.

an advocate in 1736 and was called to the bar in 1738,[36] and subsequently moved into the exclusive Pall Mall.

Perhaps Mitchell shrewdly observed that which Corfield makes clear: that the learned professions, in this case, law, were clear paths to advancement for 'the able and ambitious outsider' and though circumstance could often punctuate this idea, it was often lawyers who found themselves elevated with the noble and elite ranks.[37] Moreover, the combination of university education and training at one of London's inns of court, which was Mitchell's career path, drafted one into the 'elite of the legal societies'.[38] Not only was membership of elite society likely to bring positive financial rewards, it could and often did lead to a mutually advantageous career in politics.[39] Common lawyers indeed had a longer link to Parliament than Mitchell's time, and in the century and a half prior to Mitchell's London existence, lawyers had made up large components of the House of Commons. Their ability to mount arguments, allied with their knowledge of contemporary legal debates, made them particularly adept politicians.[40] The most successful had long careers associated with politics and often had good, superior benefactors to help them advance.[41] In the next section, this will be investigated further with particular relation to Mitchell.

iii. Mitchell's milieu: A band of political brothers?

Scots had varying motivations for moving to England. Some moved for career advancement, some because they were landed and wealthy enough to make a lifestyle in London. For Mitchell, it was a blend of both. This section will explore Mitchell's circle more deeply. Who was in it? What was their ideological makeup and allegiance, and how did Mitchell infiltrate their group? Or, what attracted them to one another? It is clear that Mitchell's early legal career had some correlation to political or parliamentary activities in that a high proportion of lawyers from the Inns of Court made their way to state or parliamentary roles in some form. This would not have escaped Mitchell's attention.

It was clear that a friend or friends in London were key for the advancement of many Scots, and reference to Smollett and Mallet has briefly explored this. In the early days of the union another Scot, John Clerk of Penicuik, had utilised social and familial connections to insinuate his way into the organisation and planning for Union, and Clerk had benefitted from this by obtaining a position for life as a Baron of the Exchequer. Clerk was anxious not to be seen as a place-seeker, and utilised his relation by marriage, the

[36] Edith Lady Haden-Guest, 'Mitchell, Andrew (1708-71), of Thainston, Aberdeen', at http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1754-1790/member/mitchell-andrew-1708-71.
[37] Corfield, *Power and the professions*, pp. 223, 226.
[38] David Lemmings, *Gentlemen and barristers: The Inns of Court and the English bar 1680-1730* (Oxford, 1990), p. 21.
[39] *Ibid.*, Chapter 7, particularly pp. 179, 181.
[40] Wilfrid R. Prest, *The rise of the barristers: A social history of the English bar 1590-1640* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 253-255.
[41] David Lemmings, *Professors of the law: Barristers and English legal culture in the eighteenth century* (Oxford, 2000), p. 269.

Duke of Queensberry, to good effect in securing employment after his training in the law. Initially enough for Clerk, this position soon overlapped with his personal interests in antiquities and art. The cultivation of this cosmopolitan taste, in conjunction with his landed status, quickly made him a magnet for fellow Scots and by the 1730s, he was feted as a Scotsman of political achievement, taste, and learning. Alexander Gordon, a friend of both Clerk and Mitchell, had said that leaving Scotland's 'superstitious and narrow thinking countrymen to a more elegant and Philosophical Climate' of England was the only way a Scot could advance.[42] What held Clerk back, according to a recent author, was that his ambition outstripped his willingness to solicit for higher employment, and he held a jaundiced view of the 'bribery and preferment' in England.[43]

Clerk's biographer Iain Gordon Brown argued that, in England, 'a desire for place and pay governed all loyalty to party'.[44] For Scots moving south, this might not always have been the case for, as we have seen, Scotland was a home of strong political divides: strong Whig sympathisers worked alongside Scots sympathetic to the Jacobites and hostile to the Hanoverian regime. In the period of Mitchell's move to London Whig opposition to Walpole's government was on the increase. For those who came just before Mitchell, like David Mallet, involvement in politics was essential for advancement. Mallet attached himself to the men who would also become the patrons and friends of Mitchell, including Chesterfield and George Lyttelton. While Mallet also became entrenched in the camp of the 'Boy Patriots', and aligned himself with Bolingbroke, Frederick Prince of Wales, and the dowager Duchess of Marlborough, it was Chesterfield, Lyttelton and James Thomson with whom Mitchell formed the quickest friendships. Later, Henry Pelham, his brother the Duke of Newcastle, Hardwicke, and Smollett would join this extended circle. It is here that we require some clarification on the political alignments into which Mitchell moved. A short synthesis will serve to delineate this.

Historians have long noted the difficulty in ascribing loyalties to political groups in British politics from the 1720s to mid-century. Reed Browning identified differences between 'Court' and 'Country' Whigs, but also between 'opposition Whigs', 'Jacobite Tories' and 'Hanoverian Tories'.[45] Christine Gerrard has observed that, during the 1720s and 1730s, 'still active party distinctions prevented the amalgamation of Whigs and Tories in opposition: a separateness symptomised by the still divisive application of the term 'Patriot''.[46] When it came to the opposition to, and eventual removal of Robert Walpole in 1742, J. C. D. Clark notes the short-lived collaboration, for want of a better term, of 'Whigs in opposition' and 'Tories' – who briefly formed a Broad Bottom ministry but which faltered during the Jacobite Rebellion and hostility

[42] Iain Gordon Brown, 'Precarious preferment in Apollo's favourite residence: London as focus for Sir John Clerk's political and cultural ambition', in Nenadic, ed, *Scots in London*, p. 69.
[43] *Ibid.*
[44] *Ibid.*
[45] Browning, *Political and constitutional ideas of the Court Whigs*, pp. 12-13.
[46] Gerrard, *The patriot opposition to Walpole*, p. 10.

from George II.[47] From the remains of this emerged the 'Old Corps' Whigs who were derived from the remains of Walpole's ministry.[48] Mitchell seems to have been more restrained in his political sympathies. Oliver Cox defines 'Patriot' in a number of ways. According to Cox, 'patriots' opposed Walpole's prioritising of European peace over British trade; his placemen and use of patronage to control the House of Commons; they opposed increasing the National Debt; foreign troop subsidies over expanding the British navy; and they sought to rid the parliamentary system of its corruption and party divisions.[49] Though he socialised with Chesterfield and Thomson, who can be identified as 'Patriots', Mitchell himself did not openly espouse a greater political view other than to oppose political operations of Walpole's ministry and benefit from its fall in 1742. Mitchell can thus be defined an 'opposition Whig' in the sense that he opposed Walpole's ministry, and we might even say that he identified with the 'Court Whigs', defined as 'a self-declared Whig who, holding power or supporting those who did, wanted government to proceed easily and smoothly, unencumbered by what he might regard as silly or wasteful or even harmful strictures'.[50] Moreover, 'patriots' or 'opposition Whigs' saw Walpole's policies and patronage 'as the antithesis of patriotic and Revolutionary principles'.[51]

As Paul Langford notes, Walpole's downfall was for so long 'the dream of the patriot leaders: a genuinely united coalition of all parties dedicated to the destruction of a corrupt ministry'.[52] But it is perhaps easier for us to see things in this light: Mitchell disliked the policies and political operations of Walpole; he was friends with gentlemen who shared the same view; when, in 1741 and again in 1747, Mitchell came into politics, his view became more pragmatic and he accepted divisions which seemed to go against the opposition stances he had taken in the 1730s. He supported Tweeddale because Tweeddale headed a Scottish Whig group collectively known as the Squadrone or Squadrone Volante; and he supported Newcastle because Newcastle vied for power with Argyll in Scotland, and Argyll was controller of Scottish interests in Parliament but also unsympathetic to the Pelham ministry.[53] Mitchell's politics might then be seen to be largely pragmatic, and there is a basis for asserting this. As one group of scholars noted, a Court Whig and a Tory leader could both subscribe to the *Craftsman* – it did not mean they both supported its views.[54] In fact, the constraints of 'party' allegiance between Whig and Tory began to emerge a little more clearly in this period.[55] To more clearly identify the players, and where Mitchell stood, it is necessary to

---

[47] J. C. D. Clark, *The dynamics of change: The crisis of the 1750s and English party systems* (Cambridge, 1982), pp. 26-27; Eveline Cruickshanks, 'Tory and Whig 'Patriots': Lord Gower and Lord Chesterfield', in Jonathan Clark and Howard Erskine-Hill, eds, *Samuel Johnson in historical context* (Houndmills and New York, 2002), p. 147.
[48] Frank O'Gorman, *The long eighteenth century: British political and social history 1688-1832*, 2nd ed (London and New York, 2016), p. 154.
[49] Oliver J. W. Cox, 'Frederick, Prince of Wales, and the first performance of 'Rule, Britannia!'', *The Historical Journal,* 56 (2013), p. 932-933.
[50] Browning, *Political and constitutional ideas of the Court Whigs*, p. 11.
[51] Kathleen Wilson, *The sense of the people: Politics, culture and imperialism in England, 1715-1785* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 124.
[52] Paul Langford, *A polite and commercial people: England, 1727-1783* (Oxford, 1989), p. 54.
[53] For Newcastle as the leader of English ministerial interests in Scotland, in opposition to Ilay, see Shaw, *The management of Scottish society*, p. 43.
[54] Geoffrey Holmes, 'Colloquy on Chapter 3', in Cannon, ed, *The Whig ascendancy*, p. 75,
[55] Linda Colley, *In defiance of oligarchy: The tory party 1714-1760* (Cambridge, 1982), p. 21.

briefly explain the 'Squadrone' interest in Scotland and in England, and what this meant for Mitchell and his associations.

Despite Mitchell living in London, he was a noted Scottish Whig and was made Tweeddale's private secretary, then his Undersecretary of State for Scotland. However, for our purposes of defining Mitchell's politics, 'Scottish Whig' seems inadequate. Robert Walpole had been a Whig, his biggest Scottish supporter and controller of patronage in Scotland, the earl of Ilay (and 3rd Duke of Argyll after 1742), was a Whig. Together, they controlled patronage in Scotland and much of England, particularly after Ilay's brother, the 2nd duke, broke with Walpole in 1740 and encouraged Tory participation in office after Walpole's demise.[56] Thus the corollary is that as an adherent to Tweeddale, Mitchell is in opposition to Ilay and Walpole. Lord Hervey noted that Ilay was 'the man on whom Sir Robert Walpole depended entirely for the management of all Scotch affairs'.[57] But Mitchell's allegiances are not so easily defined. What we can say with confidence is that Mitchell accepted Tweeddale's patronage in 1741. He thus aligned himself with the Squadrone headed by Tweeddale, but Ilay continued to hold sway over appointments even throughout Tweeddale's time as Secretary of State for Scotland.[58] J. S. Shaw argues that 'the Squadrone, in its opposition to the Walpole administration, joined the body of English malcontents who called themselves the Patriots or Country Party, under the device of protecting the King from his Ministers'.[59] The Squadrone members, according to Shaw, were definitively 'patriot', defined largely by opposition to Ilay at court.[60] Margaret Bricke identifies Mitchell as 'an avowed Patriot' ostensibly because 'he had been Tweeddale's secretary' and had been 'personally and politically close' to Robert Dundas, an influential Scotsman 'whose opposition to Argyll was widely recognised'.[61]

Walpole's downfall was caused by various factors but the Duke of Newcastle certainly seems to have distanced himself from Walpole, despite serving him for many years. Here we come back to pragmatism. The Duke of Newcastle might have distanced himself from Walpole for political survival, but having served him for so many years in the House of Lords, was he not anxious to fill Walpole's place? As Clyve Jones has noted, Newcastle's survival after Walpole's downfall relied on avoiding blame 'if he were to survive and serve (and perhaps lead) in the successor administration to Walpole's'.[62] According to O'Gorman, Newcastle formed part of an 'Old Corps' of Whigs who had served or were sympathetic to Walpole, and were quick to assume power after his fall.[63] With these points in mind, did Mitchell truly sympathise with his friends who formed large parts of the 'Boy Patriots', or younger Whigs in opposition

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 239.
[57] Shaw, *The management of Scottish society*, p. 45.
[58] Jeremy Black, *Robert Walpole and the nature of politics in early eighteenth-century Britain* (New York, 1990), p. 109.
[59] *Ibid.*, p. 49.
[60] *Ibid.*, pp. 49, 52.
[61] Margaret S. Bricke, 'The Pelhams vs. Argyll: A struggle for mastery of Scotland, 1747-1748', *Scottish Historical Review*, 61 (1982), p. 161.
[62] Clyve Jones, 'The Duke of Newcastle's letters on the fall of Walpole in 1742', *Electronic British Library Journal* (2013), p. 9.
[63] O'Gorman, *The long eighteenth century*, p. 154.

to Walpole's ministerial policies? Mitchell certainly enjoyed polemics and themed plays, and openly supported Thomson's work.

Satirising the government via plays at the theatre was a favourite method of choice for opposition polemicists.[64] Mallet's play *Eurydice* was the fruit of his early London years. The play displayed the ideas of loyalty and honour, contrasted with deceit, and in some ways invoked 'the theme of corruption' that often had appeared in opposition arguments against Walpole's government.[65] Thomson's attachment to the Boy Patriots, centred around Frederick Prince of Wales, was also demonstrated through a play, this time in his *Agamemnon*, which was widely interpreted to be supportive of the Prince in the face of his break with George II and Walpole.[66] Mitchell had attended the opening night and reported on its success to Alexander Boswell.[67] In addition, Mitchell was already close to Mallet by 1740, attending dinner at Lyttelton's with Mallet, as well as Thomson and Lord Barrington, where one of the topics of conversation was to be 'Honest Politicks'.[68]

These 'Boy Patriots' were part of a larger gathering of political opposition to Walpole. Mitchell's socialising with Lyttelton, Mallet and Thomson certainly casts him under the light of the 'Boy Patriots', so called because they made up the younger elements, or 'second wave' of the 'patriot' opposition to Walpole. Christine Gerrard's analysis of the 'Boy Patriots' supplies a clear understanding of Mitchell's political affiliations during the 1730s. They were loyal to Prince Frederick, whose opposition to his father George II added fuel to the 'Boy Patriots' cause. Thus Mitchell's talking 'Honest Politicks' with these men more than likely covered their oppositional Whig stance. Lyttelton was Prince Frederick's secretary, Mallet his undersecretary, and Thomson, as we have seen, wrote polemical poetry and plays in support of Frederick. Adding William Pitt to the list of 'Boy Patriots' (in Chapter 7 Mitchell and Pitt laud one another as old, trusted friends) further ingratiates Mitchell into this circle. Walpole's fall changed the situation for Frederick and the 'Boy Patriots', support for whom Frederick somewhat withdrew in the early 1740s. Thus, while I noted above that Mitchell moved under the patronage of Newcastle and Pelham in the 1740s, it is a natural circumstance of the changing landscape of opposition Whig politics. In fact, as Gerrard has argued, 'by 1744 Lyttelton had entered the Whig Pelham administration as Lord of the Treasury, an administration

[64] Thomas McGeary, *The politics of opera in Handel's Britain* (Cambridge, 2013), p. 101.
[65] Jung, "Staging' an Anglo-Scottish Identity', p. 82.
[66] John Loftis, 'Thomson's *Tancred and Sigismunda* and the demise of the drama of political opposition', in George Winchester Stone, ed, *The Stage and the page: London's 'whole show' in the eighteenth-century theatre* (Los Angeles and London, 1981), p. 38.
[67] Mossner, *Life of Hume*, p. 108.
[68] George Lyttelton to David Mallet, March-May 1740, in McKillop, ed, *James Thomson*, pp. 129-130.

which also in time came to incorporate other oppositional patriots of the 1730s vintage'.[69] In this last, it is clear we should include Mitchell.[70]

iv. Anglo-Scots politics and loyalty

With patriot Whig allegiances established, and his friendships to many of its leading members firm, Mitchell took the next step in his political career with his appointment as Undersecretary of State for Scotland, under John Hay, 4th Marquis of Tweeddale. This intense period, covering the Jacobite rebellion of 1745 ('the '45') and Mitchell's subsequent roles, takes us all the way up to c. 1751. Also during this time, he was elected as an MP for Aberdeenshire in 1747. In this section, Mitchell's conduct in this period will be critically assessed in a political and social context. Mitchell was never a leading member of party or faction, though he recognised it. Mitchell played his role well and was rewarded with greater trust by Newcastle. During the course of the decade, circumstances dictated that Mitchell give up his alignments with the Squadrone – effectively eliminated after the '45 – and move into a firmer accommodation with Pelham and Newcastle, who had absorbed many patriot Whigs after the fall of Walpole in 1742. His ultimate path would be involvement in Britain's foreign affairs. This section investigates several areas of his political life, such as his commitment and links to the Squadrone group of Whigs, and including the significance of Newcastle's patronage of him. In addition, what were his roles in the '45, and its fallout? What was his place in Parliament and how does this stem from his involvement as Undersecretary for Scotland? Special focus will be placed on Mitchell's parliamentary opposition to retrospective punishment of Philip Anstruther, Scottish politician and military officer, in 1751.

Andrew Mitchell had a swift beginning to his political life in London. As shown in the previous section, Mitchell formed part of a circle that espoused strong Whig loyalties but was also not afraid to vehemently publicise its patriot opposition. This was displayed most tellingly through stage and print. Mitchell supported these activities and as will be shown later in this thesis, often helped to facilitate their production. However, he was not their author. Whether he believed himself to have no propensity for this, or chose not to engage in it for the sake of his career, is not entirely known. His eventual appointment as Private Secretary to Tweeddale, a forerunner to his later appointment as Undersecretary of State for Scotland, and his growing friendship with Newcastle, points to the latter: that he was somewhat partisan in his beliefs and his friendships, but rarely put this on public display. For Mitchell, it seems, private friendships and political ties (associated with more public links such as involvement in the Royal Society,

[69] Gerrard's very helpful discussion on these issues can be found in Gerrard, *The patriot opposition to Walpole*, pp. 33-45.

[70] Mitchell was still firmly attached to Lyttelton in 1747 when he sent the latter's *Observations on the conversion and apostleship of St Paul* to Duncan Forbesm, introducing it to Forbes 'a pamphlet [Lyttelton] had lately published. I think the argument ingenious, and the writing very elegant'. See *More Culloden Papers*, p. 184.

the Dilettanti, and the Egyptian Society) were the main vehicle for the advancement of his career at this stage.

A studious observer of political changes in England in Scotland, Mitchell wrote letters to friends in which he closely observed and reported on parliamentary debate and faction. The same manuscript also contains some of his notes on the Porteous Riot, written during his time studying for the bar in England, his notes on the constitution, and on the power of the judiciary in Scotland to handle the aftermath of the Porteous Riot. Mitchell wrote his friend and former Grand Tour companion Andrew Wauchope in 1734, reporting on parliamentary division, of which 'the spirit of party (I am sorry I can give it no better name) rages with redoubled fury at the present'.[71] Mitchell seems to have been largely neutral in his written observations of parliament, and in relation to the processes surrounding the discussion of how best to address the legal treatment of Porteous and the rioters, Mitchell left notes of his attendances at the 1737 parliamentary enquiries. In these documents, Mitchell's prime concern seems not to be a judgement on Porteous's actions, but rather the parliamentary debate over the powers of judges in Scotland and England to adjudicate the affair.[72] In this, Mitchell might have been just as out of touch with political discontent in Edinburgh as Ilay and others in London.[73] His notes fed into the wider debate on British control of the Scottish magistracy and justiciary, Robert Walpole's attempts first to interfere and have Porteous pardoned, and then to punish Edinburgh city itself, and its magistrates.[74] In this fractious period, it has been claimed that the Union, and Scotland's relationship with England, was under threat.[75] Certainly the leadership in the Parliament were divided, as Lord Carteret raised a motion to fine Edinburgh £2,000 to be given to Porteous's widow, and to force Edinburgh to forfeit its privileges as a city.[76] A later chronicle noted how 'some of the most violent opposers of government befriended the bill, and others absented themselves while it was depending'.[77] The riot and the ensuing enquiries did little to settle the Parliament or debates over the equality and respect in the Union. While Mitchell recorded dispassionately the magistrates and councillors of the city of Edinburgh blaming both the Provost Alexander Wilson, and the lack of action by the citizens of Edinburgh themselves,[78] some commentators railed against the perceived injustice of the government's actions toward Edinburgh and the lack of the proper application of justice.[79] To say Mitchell took a political side in his views would be to mischaracterise his papers. His prime concern is for the

[71] Mitchell to Andrew Wauchope of Niddrie, 12 April 1734, BL Add. MS 58293, f. 20.
[72] BL Add. MS 58293, f. 3.
[73] H. T. Dickinson and K. J. Logue, 'The Porteous Riot, 1736: Events in a Scottish protest against the act of union with England', *History Today*, 22 (1972), p. 279.
[74] H. T. Dickinson, *The politics of the people in eighteenth-century Britain* (Houndmills and London, 1994), p. 218.
[75] Dickinson and Logue, 'The Porteous Riot', pp. 280-281.
[76] For the privileges, see Carteret's speech in *The History of the Proceedings of the House of Lords from the Restoration in 1660 to the Present Time* (London, 1742), particularly p. 141.
[77] *Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England*, Vol. X, *A. D. 1737-1739* (London, 1812), p. 190.
[78] Mitchell's notes, 12 May 1737, BL Add. MS 58293, f. 9.
[79] James Erskine, Lord Grange, *Reasons against the Bill before the House of Lords for disabling the Lord Provost of the City of Edinburgh; to hold any Office of magistracy, and for fining the said City in L. 2000 Sterling* (London, 1737).

parliamentary and legal processes pertaining to the management of the affair and the punishments meted out. It was the first of Mitchell's involvements with Anglo-Scottish political skirmishes.

Mitchell became private secretary to Tweeddale in 1741.[80] Perhaps there was an inclination this way when Maclaurin wrote him in 1735 that he observed Mitchell's change of heart over the direction of his career. Perhaps Mitchell had informed him of his inclination to take the English bar, outlined above, or perhaps he had sketched for Maclaurin a greater career goal? The case for the former seems more likely as Maclaurin wrote that 'I fear George Warrender and you help each other to lose the natural passion for your country'.[81] This is supported by Bisset's note that Mitchell had a view to practice English law immediately upon his return from Europe, in 1735.[82] Little is noted in Bisset's collection of letters about the period of Mitchell's early London years, which I have tried to reconstruct elsewhere in this thesis. In 1742, when Tweeddale was appointed Secretary of State for Scotland, he took Mitchell with him as his Undersecretary. This put Mitchell into firmer connection with the Duke of Newcastle, though he may have been known to him earlier.[83]

The position had been a perfect fit for Mitchell. The Lord President and Mitchell's close friend Duncan Forbes, wrote to him that his appointment as Undersecretary for Scotland received 'universal approbation' back home.[84] Forbes was a warm supporter of Mitchell and had done much to oppose punishment for Edinburgh after the Porteous Riots.[85] Mitchell's rise to Private Secretary for Tweeddale had its earlier roots, as he had in all likelihood a good friendship with Tweeddale's brother George, who had also studied with Turnbull in the Netherlands.[86] In one of his earliest letters to Tweeddale himself, Mitchell also expressed his salutations to George.[87] Thus Mitchell had drawn closer to Tweeddale politically in the precise moment that Tweeddale himself became somewhat politically independent. Shaw has argued that by the time Carteret came to power in 1742, and Tweeddale became Secretary of State for Scotland, the latter 'represented himself, but may be looked upon as a remnant of the Squadrone', but notes Tweeddale's lack of political ability.[88]

Mitchell used his powers as Undersecretary to demonstrate his political ability. It is a testament to his activities from 1742-46 that his political career was not harmed in the same way as that of Tweeddale. From the outset both Mitchell and Tweeddale recognised the challenge before them: with Walpole removed for various reasons, not least scrutiny over the corruption of his regime, it was necessary to reinforce the position of the new Secretary of State for Scotland with shows of support. Both Tweeddale and Mitchell

[80] Doran, *Andrew Mitchell*, p. 8; Scott, 'Mitchell, Andrew', *ODNB*.
[81] Maclaurin to Mitchell, 18 November 1735, in Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 1, p. 9.
[82] Bisset, *Memoirs*, Vol. 1, p. 12.
[83] Mitchell to Tweeddale, 9 September 1742, NLS MS Yester 7049-7050, Tweeddale Papers, f. 27; Tweeddale to Mitchell, 16 September, 1742, in Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 1, p. 18.
[84] Duncan Forbes to Mitchell, 1 April 1742, in Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 1., p. 15.
[85] See *Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England*, Vol. X, pp. 189-190.
[86] Mijers, *'News from the Republick of Letters'*, p. 146.
[87] Mitchell to Tweeddale, 9 September 1742, NLS Tweeddale Papers, MSS 7049-50, f. 27.
[88] Shaw, *Political history*, pp. 71-72.

wrote to Duncan Forbes requesting that he, and Robert Dundas, Lord Arniston, travel to London to advise on the best course of action for Scotland after Walpole's removal. Tweeddale wished to 'lay before his Majesty such matters as may tend to create a confidence in and give more universall [sic] content to the people'.[89] The vacuum of power filled by Tweeddale was also recognised as an opportunity to gain further advantage over Tweeddale's political enemy, the earl of Ilay. With Tweeddale appointing Mitchell as his Undersecretary, Forbes recognised that it showed that Tweeddale was intent on acting 'in earnest, that he will act with disinterested views, and make use of disinterested persons, to carry on the Public Service'.[90]

Mitchell also continually demonstrated his loyalty to the Crown and the ministry, in addition to his management of Scottish affairs in London more generally in Tweeddale's absences. Beginning only a few months into his posting in 1742, Mitchell closely monitored rumoured or confirmed movements in the Jacobite cause and to manage Anglo-Scottish political patronage and affairs. Tweeddale was aware of the need for a 'scheme for preserving the peace of the Highlands, and preventing depredations ... since all attempts hitherto made have proved ineffectual'.[91] Mitchell wrote Tweeddale that he had personally overseen plans to hunt out and capture a fugitive Jacobite soldier, John Stewart, and had coordinated these plans with Newcastle.[92] He also informed the Lord Advocate and fellow Squadrone member Robert Craigie of Glendoick, of the same watchfulness.[93] He maintained this vigilance to the point of having men follow Stewart's wife when she came to London, and had clearly established a network of informants on the Jacobite cause.[94] When Tweeddale was in Scotland or absent, Mitchell reported diligently. In the same letter as previously, Mitchell told Tweeddale of rumours circulating in London about the latter's 'endeavouring to destroy the D. of Argyle's interest in the town of Edinburgh'. Moreover, he told Tweeddale that more had happened in London in his absence than Tweeddale could fathom.[95]

Mitchell was very conscious of the uneasy balance of politics within Scotland, between England and Scotland, and with the ministry in London. When Forbes asked him about the state of political affairs at the beginning of 1745, Mitchell set out some of his thoughts.

> When your Lordship asked from me an explication of the late phenomenon in Politicks, you had certainly forgot that it is far more hard to give a true solution of a Political Phenomenon than of a natural one; because in the one, there are certain unalterable and established laws,

[89] Tweeddale to Duncan Forbes, 23 February 1741/2, in *Culloden Papers*, p. 175.
[90] Duncan Forbes to Mitchell, 1 April 1742, *Culloden Papers*, p. 180.
[91] Tweeddale to Duncan Forbes, 24 August 1742, *Culloden Papers*, p. 184.
[92] Mitchell writes of 'Mr Stuart'. John Stewart, known also as John Roy Stewart, was a noted Jacobite soldier who had escaped Inverness gaol in 1736 and fled to the continent. He returned in 1745 with the Jacobite forces. Mitchell to Tweeddale, 21 September 1742, NLS Tweeddale Papers, MSS 7049-50, f. 68; Stuart Handley, 'Stewart, John (c. 1700-1747)', *ODNB*, at www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26493, accessed 13 November 2017.
[93] Mitchell to Lord Advocate Robert Craigie of Glendoick, Whitehall, 20 October 1742, NRS GD1/609/2/54.
[94] Mitchell to Tweeddale, 28 September 1742, NLS Tweeddale Papers, MSS 7049-50, f. 71; Mitchell to Tweeddale, 2 October 1742, NLS Tweeddale Papers, MSS 7049-50, f. 89^{v}.
[95] Mitchell to Tweeddale, 21 September 1742, NLS Tweeddale Papers, MSS 7049-50, f. 68^{v}.

> by which from the effect produced the cause may be conjectured; whereas in the other, the principles are not fixed nor determined, and, the appearances being generally deceitful and fallacious, it is almost impossible from the effect to trace the Cause.[96]

Mitchell noted the uneasy political balance arising in 1742 from Walpole's removal and the diminution in Ilay's power.[97] 'Your [Lordship] must already be fully informed of the imperfect & unnatural coalition that happened three years ago; the consequence of which was a violent and early jealousy, that shewed itself on every occasion, between the old and the new administration'.[98] Mitchell explained to Forbes the forces challenging to form and control a ministry, noting Carteret's failure and that of Cobham and his followers. Carteret, Mitchell told Forbes, lost the contest against 'the Brothers', Newcastle and Pelham, and the King was not yet favourable to Newcastle's involvement in a ministry. In general, Mitchell thought that Pelham and Newcastle weathered the storm and that stability post-Walpole would soon be arriving. He noted, 'though I think the means made use of to bring about this late change have been rather too rough and harsh, yet I heartily wish that the whole may not suffer for it'.[99]

Mitchell continued his political observations in letters to Forbes, whom he had already identified as a kind of mentor. The changes in the ministry in early 1745, noted above, continued to preoccupy Mitchell. His letters show a sensitivity to negotiations over place, position, and rank in the Ministry, and an acceptance that his road to further success led through the Pelhams. He told Forbes that 'after the Brothers, the next in Dignity, as well as in Ability, is the Lord Chancellor, who, they say, spoke to his M. with great Zeal and Steadiness'.[100] His information continued; 'The D. of Richmond and Devonshire joined in the Cabal; and the Earl of Harrington was a necessary man, as the only person of this Sect that was qualified to take care of foreign Affairs; but it was said that he had taken care not to involve himself so far as to become obnoxious to his master'. Mitchell identified the opposition Whigs leading criticisms of the administration: Chesterfield, Cobham, Mr. Waller, & Mr. Pitt; 'and for the other, Lord Gower & Sir Watkin Williams Wynn'. It had taken four weeks to negotiate a new ministry, and not all were satisfied. 'Some have already expressed their disapprobation as warmly as others of the old party have their discontent, that any of the Tories should be taken in'. Mitchell said that the new ministry would hold this parliament, but he could not guess at how they would go thereafter.

The Tweeddale Papers also display Mitchell's abilities to promptly communicate the problems arising in the secretariat. He showed an aptitude for patronage and its control and distribution, as well as a

---

[96] Mitchell to Duncan Forbes, 26 January 1744/45, *Culloden Papers*, p. 197.
[97] This part of Walpole's life and his involvement in British politics, and links to Newcastle and Ilay, are explored in Jonathan Oates, 'Sir Robert Walpole after his fall from power', *History*, 91 (2006), pp. 218-230.
[98] *Ibid.*
[99] *Ibid.*
[100] This and the remainder of this paragraph drawn from Mitchell to Duncan Forbes, 29 January 1744/45, *Culloden Papers*, p. 198.

healthy disdain for bribery and its use for personal gain.[101] He additionally showed an ability to make apt remarks on the political character of men at that period. When the Duke of Argyll was dismissed as too old to begin a major project he was proposing, Argyll replied to his critics that if he were to die tomorrow, he would do all the good he could today. Mitchell wrote Tweeddale that 'No hero of Antiquity, nor no Plutarch for him, every said a better thing, but alas! How fickle is man, and how late is it before he arrives at the summit of Virtue'.[102] Mitchell's letters of 1744 are primarily concerned with the war being waged on the continent, and contain little about any Jacobite intrigues or particular party loyalties in Parliament and London. He took a leading role in the debates over Crown interests, and other political patronage interests, including a growing interest in the surveying of Scotland,[103] and the vacant Chair of Oriental Languages at Glasgow University. The debate over the latter issue was again a matter of who in fact had political control to appoint intellectuals, and from where this influence stemmed.

Mitchell was often consulted for, or played a role in, the distribution and administration of patronage in Scotland through his role as Undersecretary of State for Scotland. In this way, his political influence and reputation was to grow significantly in the four years this role existed. It also shows that, willingly or unwillingly, Mitchell was identified with the interest of the Squadrone, or, as it might be considered in the period 1742-1746, the opposition to Ilay. On the death of Charles Morthland, Professor of Hebrew and Oriental Languages at Glasgow, Mitchell was asked to provide information about the Crown's interest in a new appointment. A dispute arose over the right of appointment and whether this right belonged to the university or the Crown. In truth, disputes over the appointments, the salaries, and the patronage of the universities had been contested since early in the century, with the Duke of Montrose holding a large share of the interest, and this being contested by Lord Ilay, brother to the Duke of Argyll. Mitchell's involvement thus pitted 'Squadrone' members (discussed below) with opposing Ilay followers.[104] Morthland had been a Squadrone supporter, and the election of the new Duke of Montrose as Chancellor meant that a professor politically aligned with the 'Squadrone' was a priority.[105] Mitchell indicated to Tweeddale in letters from October 1744 that Lord Carteret had put forward a candidate to replace the deceased Morthland.[106] There was nothing out of the ordinary about this, but that the university took exception to this perceived infringement of their ancient right. As James Buchan has noted in relation to Edinburgh, universities in Scotland were susceptible to 'pattern[s] of influence, patronage, and corporate jealousy'.[107] In a memorial transmitted to Mitchell from the Duke of Montrose, the university claimed to

[101] See for example Mitchell to Tweeddale, 12 October 1742, NLS Tweeddale Papers, MSS 7049-50, f. 113.
[102] Mitchell to Tweeddale, 27 September 1744, NLS Tweeddale Papers, MS 7063, f. 138.
[103] Rachel Hewitt, 'A family affair: The Dundas family of Arniston and the military survey of Scotland (1747-1755)', *Imago Mundi*, 64 (2012), pp. 60-77. The accurate mapping of distant areas of Britain had been an interest in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. However, in her recent book on surveying Britain, Rachel Hewitt shows that the real work on mapping did not start until the 1740s, largely driven by Robert Dundas of Arniston. See Rachel Hewitt, *Map of a nation: A biography of the Ordnance Survey* (London, 2010).
[104] Emerson, *Academic patronage*, pp. 93-94.
[105] *Ibid*., pp. 100, 107-108.
[106] Mitchell to Tweeddale, 2 October 1744, NLS Tweeddale Papers, MS 7064, f. 4.
[107] James Buchan, Capital of the Mind: How Edinburgh Changed the World (London, 2004), p. 14.

be riven by differing views over the successor, besides their claim that 'the Masters had formerly elected to this Professorship'.[108] The memorial indicated a complex relationship between the Crown and the right of the university for appointment, salary, and preferment, the Crown having supplied a large portion of the Professor's salaries from Queen Anne onward (though at this point only by the King's pleasure) but the incumbents being chosen by the university.[109] Carteret's proposed candidate complicated an already politicised process of appointment. Mitchell's coordination of the political process from London, in the absence of Tweeddale, seems to have prevented a further growth in wrangling over the position, despite the Lord Advocate Robert Craigie expressing concern about Westminster's intervention. Craigie's vehement letter to Tweeddale shows the ongoing political tensions between Glasgow, Westminster, and now Edinburgh. Examining the university's case, and that of the Crown's, Craigie stated 'I am humbly of opinion that the right of electing this Professor is in the University and that the additional salary granted to the Professor during His Majesty's pleasure does not intitle [sic] His Majesty to present a Professor'.[110] The chair went to Alexander Dunlop, son of the former Greek Professor Alexander Dunlop, and was a political loss for the Squadrone.[111]

Just who were the 'Squadrone' and what did they matter to Mitchell? The 'Squadrone' or 'Squadrone Volante' had been influential from the beginning of the century, and this small but powerful group had been key to the formation of Union with England. The Squadrone originally included the name additional 'volante', or 'flying' Squadrone to denote their individual political identity, 'different from the notions we have hitherto had of Court and Country'.[112] At the beginning of the century they were made up of the prominent Scottish noble families, representing Scots in favour of union. The second marquess of Tweeddale, the grandfather of the man to whom Mitchell was Undersecretary, had been a leader in the Squadrone's formation.[113] The Squadrone played a vital role in amalgamating British politics in the early years of union and their support for Union was secured by financial as much as political incentives. They thus formed a vital link for Scottish interests in parliament and in London – they cannot be said to be solely a Scottish group. Ideologically, they were strong supporters of Hanover as well as the Union.[114] From these early years also stems the uneasy cooperation of the 2nd Duke of Argyll with the Squadrone, the former being given large financial incentives to support the court Whigs, which relied on the support of the Squadrone.[115] Yet the cohesion of this early period was diluted in the reigns of the first two Georges, where 'party' was more divided and the elements of 'opposition' rose sharply, particularly in the period of Robert

[108] Mitchell to Tweeddale, 4 October 1744, NLS Tweeddale Papers, MS 7064, f. 13.
[109] 'Memorial concerning the State of the Profession of Oriental Languages in the University of Glasgow', NLS Tweeddale Papers, MS 7064, f. 14.
[110] Robert Craigie to Tweeddale, 18 October 1744, NLS Tweeddale Papers, MS 7064, f. 30v.
[111] Emerson, *Academic patronage*, pp. 113-114.
[112] Laurence A. B. Whitley, *A great grievance: Ecclesiastical lay patronage in Scotland until 1750* (Eugene, 2013), p. 102.
[113] Derek J. Patrick and Christopher A. Whatley, 'Persistence, principle and patriotism in the making of the union of 1707: The revolution, Scottish parliament and the *squadrone volante*', *History*, 92 (2007), pp. 166-167.
[114] *Ibid.*, pp. 181, 183.
[115] Devine, *The Scottish Nation*, pp. 11-16.

Walpole's ministry in the 1730s.[116] Nevertheless, Hardwicke still recognised the influence of 'the flying squadron' as a 'third party' in British politics alongside the 'Court' party and an opposition, but Clark has argued that the 'flying squadron' might be better termed the 'opposition whig party'.[117] The Squadrone vied for control of Scottish politics with the second duke of Argyll, but predominantly with his brother, the earl of Ilay, from the 1720s.

For Scots, the Squadrone was the haven of those who belonged to the Whig cause but were opposed to the group gathered around the Duke of Argyll, the Argathelians. While both sides were committed to the Hanoverians and Protestantism, Argyll's accumulation of all Scottish political power caused serious differences to remain during and after his lifetime.[118] The Squadrone was politically weakened by the dismissal of its members by Walpole in 1733, but they subsequently became strongly integrated with 'Cobham's Cubs', formed by Sir Richard Temple, Viscount Cobham, who had long been associated with Prince Frederick's 'Boy Patriot' circle.[119] Tweeddale, as noted, was a leading Squadrone member and this would have placed Mitchell well in line with anti-Argathelian interests, and in Newcastle's line of sight. But Mitchell was first and foremost the Undersecretary for Scotland, and the rise of Jacobitism that manifested itself most terribly in the '45 proved to be Tweeddale's downfall, but Mitchell's start in politics. It secured for him Newcastle's support, and allowed him to hold off the patronage shackles of Ilay, by then 3rd Duke of Argyll.

Mitchell could most ably embody his pledged loyalty to Crown and ministry by his actions during the '45. Letters from and to Mitchell in his papers, and in the Culloden Papers, reveal the urgency and wisdom with which Mitchell carried out his tasks as Undersecretary in regard to the Jacobite Rebellion. Tweeddale has been criticised for his mismanagement of the rebellion. Indeed, on 17 August 1745, almost four weeks after the Young Pretender landed in Scotland, Tweeddale wrote to Duncan Forbes that 'I own, I have never been alarmed with the Reports of the Pretender's Son landing in Scotland. I consider it as a rash and desperate attempt, that can have no other consequence than the ruin of those concerned in it', acknowledging at the same time the lack of crown authority in the Highlands.[120]

From London, Mitchell did his utmost to coordinate with Duncan Forbes, and although hampered by incomplete information, seems to have emerged from the crisis with his reputation intact. Despite Tweeddale's calamitous handling of the extraction of information from captured Jacobites, such as Hector Maclean and his servant Lachlan Maclean, Mitchell's participation in the interrogations of Jacobites was a zealous reiteration of his commitment to the Hanoverian succession. Nothing is noted of Mitchell's role in the interrogations and examinations of the Macleans, or those of John Blair and James Burnett, to all of

[116] William Speck, 'Whigs and Tories dim their glories: English political parties under the first two Georges', in Cannon, ed, *The Whig Ascendancy*, p. 69.
[117] Cf. J. C. D. Clark, 'A general theory of party, opposition and government, 1688-1832', *The Historical Journal*, 23 (1980), pp. 303.
[118] Lenman, 'A client society', pp. 87-88.
[119] Gerrard, *The patriot opposition to Walpole*, pp. 34-36.
[120] Tweeddale to Duncan Forbes, 17 August 1745, *Culloden Papers*, p. 209.

which he subscribed.[121] I have noted above that Mitchell emerged with credibility despite the judgement of historians that Tweeddale comprehensively mismanaged the defence efforts.[122] For example, Tweeddale and others seem to have been ignorant of Hector Maclean's role in recruiting in Edinburgh, and Maclean's knowledge of Prince Charles' plans, committing Maclean to Newgate Prison without being able to act on any information gathered.[123] How then did Mitchell escape with his reputation, and still with the possibility of a career in British politics?

Despite Tweeddale's inability to effectively marshal opposition to the Jacobite Rebellion, Mitchell's position somewhat shielded him from blame. However, he also did his utmost to coordinate some resistance efforts with Duncan Forbes and Robert Craigie. He enclosed to the latter urgent letters on commissions for soldiers and commanders to be raised from the Highlands; supplied lists of deserters; and argued for the proper defence of the government by taking up arms and supplying them to the clans, under the assertion that in this particular instance, natural law fulfilled the law of Scotland.[124] In short, he showed the zeal – 'at a time when Zeal is no epidemick'[125] – to monitor the Jacobite threat prior to its outbreak in 1745, as noted above. Mitchell noted the internal divisions in the Ministry, as well as those who cast the blame on Scotland. 'I need not mention to your Lop the unfortunate situation of this Country', he wrote to Forbes, 'a divided and a diffident Ministry; the rage of Party still so strong, that they are more animated against each other than against the common enemy'.[126] Moreover, Mitchell noted the strained relations in Parliament, even of those who were on the same political sides.

> Affairs in the House of Commons are not now carried on in the manner they were when your Lop sat in Parliament; their proceedings now are like the operations of an Army composed of different nations, where all the leaders must be satisfied; and where there is properly no Commander in Chief; tho' the influence of some be great, yet in many points they must yield to their new Allies.[127]

---

[121] For the Maclean interrogations, see National Archives Kew, SP36/66/234 and SP36/66/241; for the Blair interrogation, see SP36/66/250; for Burnett, see SP 54/38/40.
[122] Rosalind Mitchison, *Lordship to patronage. Scotland 1603-1745* (London, 1983), p. 163.
[123] There was some difficulty in deciphering Maclean's letters, written in code. See Schuchard, *Emanuel Swedenborg*, p. 392. For more on the Jacobite flight to Sweden, see Göran Behre, 'Jacobite Refugees in Gothenburg after Culloden', *Scottish Historical Review*, 70 (1991), pp. 58-65. Maclean was released in 1747 but continued to agitate for the Jacobite cause. See Doron Zimmerman, *The Jacobite movement in Scotland and in exile, 1746-1759* (Houndmills and London, 2003), p. 211n123-126.
[124] Mitchell to Robert Craigie of Glendoick, 5 September 1745, NRS GD1/609/4/8; 7 September 1745, GD1/609/4/9.
[125] Mitchell to Lord President Duncan Forbes, 5 September 1745, *Culloden Papers*, p. 219.
[126] Mitchell to Duncan Forbes, 2 October 1745, *Culloden Papers*, p. 227.
[127] Mitchell to Duncan Forbes, 19 November 1745, *Culloden Papers*, pp. 254-255.

Mitchell lamented the division that undermined attempts to end the Jacobite Rebellion. As he wrote to Forbes, he was most sensible of the damage done to Scotland's reputation and those of its people, who he believed were being falsely accused of Jacobite sympathies. The corollary of this was that the Scots were disloyal subjects. He was moved to write:

> I am really in the deepest distress. The ruin of my country, and the disgrace and shame to which it is and will continue to be exposed, have affected me to that degree, that I am hardly master of myself. Already every man of our country is looked on as a traitor, as one secretly inclined to the Pretender, and waiting but an opportunity to declare. The guilty and the innocent are confounded together, and the crimes of a few imputed to the whole nation. But I hope your [Lordship] will soon do something to assist your principles, to save your country, and to recover, if possible, its honour.[128]

It is perhaps because of his adopted English lifestyle, his contacts, and his immersion in its politics, that Mitchell was not suspected himself. His position was no guarantee – there were Jacobite MPs aplenty, along with enough collaborators in Scotland to sometimes make identifying Jacobites quite difficult. His knowledge of English law certainly extricated him somewhat from the suspicious fray, and the diminishing trust in Scottish courts to prosecute and convict Jacobites meant that Mitchell's efforts to administer justice from London looked all the more promising.[129] As we shall see later, it was also the recognition that he was an extremely honest man, and zealous in defence of the interests of the Crown, that most struck Newcastle.

Mitchell remained in favour after the defeat of the Jacobites at Culloden. It was a major vote of confidence in his amenability to English political interests. Others were not so lucky and were heavily censured by observers. William Cross, Professor of Law at Glasgow, wrote that the Squadrone interest had failed Scotland during the '45. '[The Squadrone interest] accidentally got into a great share of the management of this country, when the late Rebellion broke out and what a fine spot of work they made of it, is known to every body, and gives a better idea of the men than it is possible to describe or convey in any other way'.[130] Despite this, in 1746, Mitchell was able to take pride that some Scots Noblemen kept their heads in the investigations of the Jacobite Lord Lovat.[131] While a similar stance on Jacobite estates was undertaken after the 1715 rebellion, it proved to be ineffective.[132] In 1746, the measures of punishment

[128] Mitchell to Duncan Forbes, 23 October 1745, *Culloden Papers*, p. 426.
[129] Murray Pittock, 'Treacherous objects: Towards a theory of Jacobite material culture', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies,* 34 (2011), p. 41.
[130] Shaw, *The management of Scottish society*, p. 53.
[131] Mitchell to Lord President Duncan Forbes, 26 December 1746, *Culloden Papers*, p. 295.
[132] Annette Smith, 'The Forfeited Estates Papers, 1745: A study of the work of the Commissioners for the Forfeited Annexed Estates, 1755-1784, with particular reference to their contribution to the development of communications

were harsher, and the best explanation for Mitchell's survival, despite his home near Aberdeen being listed as a punishable part of the Highlands, was his willingness to work for the Hanoverian regime against Highlanders and rebellious Scots. There were to be no bargains struck between Scottish Whigs and Jacobites as there were after the Fifteen.[133] His unfailing support of the government and his participation in bringing Jacobites to account for their tacit or overt support of the rebellion would benefit him.

Mitchell's conduct received the notice of Newcastle and Henry Pelham in relation to entering Parliament. Newcastle had under his control one of, if not the largest share of parliamentary seats, which in 1747 totalled thirteen seats. Likewise, in Scotland, Ilay (Argyll) had increased his controlling interests.[134] Mitchell had maintained his assiduous coverage of parliamentary politics, and took hundreds of pages of notes to keep abreast of debate.[135] A strategy was devised for him to come in for the Elgin Burghs, but Argyll defeated this idea.[136] It was becoming clear that Mitchell would be involved in the skirmish for power between the Pelhams and Ilay, now 3rd Duke of Argyll. However, the simplicity of situation belies this statement. In effect, as Shaw argues, Ilay (Argyll) might have had his power depleted after the departure of Walpole, but he still held power of much of the patronage of Scotland and even when not having a direct role in a political appointment, its success depended on his agreement.[137] As Shaw notes, 'this say which Ilay had in Scottish patronage, even when at his weakest, marked the administration's recognition over the years that he, not the Squadrone, usually had the right, the authority, to dictate the general management of Scotland'.[138] This was a continuation of affairs as they had been under Walpole, for though Newcastle was a Secretary responsible for Scotland, appointments and patronage had always gone through Ilay.[139]

In the process of deciding on standing for parliament in Arthur Forbes' Aberdeenshire seat, Mitchell weighed up the competing interests he would contend with. He was between competing Anglo-Scottish patronage interests. He told Duncan Forbes that he needed his advice more than ever.[140] 'As you have already been my Oracle, you will forgive the freedom I take with you on this occasion', Mitchell wrote. First, he asked Forbes for 'advice as to the expediency of my being in parliament', and secondly, to ascertain the likelihood of success and how it might be attained. For his being in parliament, Mitchell admitted that he wanted it more before than now, and has seen too much of parties, 'yet still I find my wishes of this kind are not extinguished; and I fear there is hardly any other road open to me, now that I am cut off from my profession, & in no train of business'. Mitchell told Forbes that he had had 'great men' offer support but noted the fickle natures of those whose promises 'are lighter than air, and their dispositions more

in Scotland in the eighteenth century', PhD. Diss., University of St Andrews (1975), pp. 1-4. A detailed examination is also carried out in Margaret Sankey, *Jacobite prisoners of the 1715 rebellion* (Burlington, 2005), pp. 130-149.
133 Margaret Sankey and Daniel Szechi, 'Elite culture and the decline of Scottish Jacobitism 1716-1745', *Past & Present*, 173 (2001), pp. 90-128.
134 John Cannon, *Aristocratic century: The peerage of eighteenth-century England* (Cambridge, 1984), p. 107.
135 BL Add. MSS 58301-58310.
136 Doran, *Andrew Mitchell*, p. 9.
137 Shaw, *The management of Scottish society*, pp. 53-54.
138 *Ibid.*, p. 54.
139 Bricke, 'The Pelhams vs. Argyll', p. 158.
140 This paragraph drawn from a long letter Mitchell to Duncan Forbes, 6 April 1747, *Culloden Papers*, pp. 475-476.

uncertain than the weather. The only way, therefore, to fix them is, to be in a situation to serve or to hurt them'. Mitchell believed that in the right circumstances, Newcastle and Pelham would help him, and he knew Ilay would be jealous of his attempt if he accepted the Pelhams' patronage. Whether he attempted it, and how, depended on the advice of Forbes: 'I depend on your judgement more than on my own'. Mitchell wanted to stand on his own as much as possible, but thought that securing Lord Barrington's support might be vital for getting in 'without *the Court assistance*' [Mitchell's emphasis] as 'the best title to ask for it is to have some interest of one's own'.

The step into Parliament was, for Mitchell, not so easy as it seems. His witnessing of the calamities of the '45 and the disintegration of party and unity wore him down. He confessed to Duncan Forbes that, when his stepping into Parliament was mentioned in 1747, his desire was lower than it was formerly. 'I have seen so much of the management of parties, and known too many members, to think of the H[ouse] of Com[mons] as I once did', he wrote Forbes, while admitting that he could not let the opportunity pass.[141] However, he framed this in equivocal terms, claiming that no other doors were open to him, and his law profession had lapsed. His aim, he told Forbes, was to play a big and honourable part at home or abroad and remain independent of controlling interests in his election.[142]

But Mitchell had more than interest. There are two factors that came together to assist his election. First, his potential predecessor Arthur Forbes had been cautiously accepted by Ilay for some time. Throughout his parliamentary tenure Forbes voted predominantly with the Argathelians, being known later as a member of 'the Duke of Argyll's gang'.[143] Mitchell set out for Scotland immediately, in order to canvass support for his campaign. He was angered to realise that some of those who might have committed to him had given their word for others, namely Sir Archibald Grant. But Newcastle threw his weight behind Mitchell. Newcastle stated his reasons for supporting Mitchell in a letter to the latter in June 1747, some four months after Mitchell received notice that Arthur Forbes intended to step aside for him. Newcastle wrote that 'the knowledge I have of your zealous attachment to his Majesty's service, and the true interest of your King and country, and my particular regard and friendship for you, are such, that it would be a great pleasure to me if I could in any way contribute to it'.[144] Pelham also informed Mitchell of 'my sincere wishes for your good success [in Scotland, where Mitchell was headed to secure election]; and I flatter myself when you get into the country you will find all the King's friends dispos'd to make your election easy'.[145] In a more political sense, it also enabled Newcastle to continue capitalising on the stock of the Duke of Argyll, who was under attack for his family's perceived mismanagement of Scottish politics in the

[141] Mitchell to Duncan Forbes, 6 April 1747, *Culloden Papers*, pp. 475-476.
[142] *Ibid.*, p. 476.
[143] R. S. Lea, 'Forbes, Sir Arthur, 4th Bt. (1709-73), of Craigievar, Aberdeen', at http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1715-1754/member/forbes-sir-arthur-1709-73, accessed 15 August 2018.
[144] Newcastle to Mitchell, 11 June 1747, BL Add. MS 58283, f. 1.
[145] Henry Pelham to Mitchell, 12 June 1747, BL Add. MS 58289, f. 107.

wake of the '45.[146] After the '45 the Anglo-Scottish political relationship, according to Jeremy Black, was one involving the entry of a broader range of powerful Scots into the English political scene, leaving no space for dissent or mixed loyalties.[147]

Secondly, Ilay himself had final consent. Ilay's Scottish second-in-command, Andrew Fletcher, Lord Milton, was at this time Lord Justice Clerk. He and Ilay formed a barrier to Mitchell's success despite Mitchell believing he had the numbers to carry his election without them. Newcastle wrote to Milton to urge him to withdraw Sir Archibald Grant as a competitor to Mitchell, as he accordingly did in concert with Ilay (Argyll), and Mitchell accordingly, though grudgingly, acquiesced to thanking Ilay for the ease of his success.[148] Newcastle and his brother Pelham were assisted in their ambitions for Mitchell by overwhelming results in their favour in the general election of 1747.[149] Mitchell had reported a highly favourable reception for himself in Aberdeenshire, and navigated the complicated allegiances to Newcastle and Argyll respectively with perceptive adroitness,[150] eventually also conceding his obligation to Argyll for not interceding against him.[151] His opponent Sir Archibald Grant had made moves to secure the candidacy, but even Grant's own brother, William Grant, said he would support Mitchell if his brother could not secure adequate support.[152] For William Grant, Mitchell was 'himself a good Whig, and educated in a way that makes him acquainted with public affairs, and consequently qualified to be a member of parliament, and as being acceptable to the administration'.[153] Newcastle confirmed as much to Hugh Hume-Campbell, 3rd Earl of Marchmont, later in 1747. Newcastle confirmed he wanted men zealous for the Crown's interests over local interests. Marchmont wrote in his diary that '[Newcastle] said, he would tell us the foundation of all his politics, which was, that in Scotland those only who were attached to his Majesty's family should be employed, without regard to any other factions or divisions; but that this was impracticable, for now there was no government at all there; nothing was done'. Moreover, Marchmont noted that Newcastle had failed once before in the face of Ilay's patronage power. Newcastle told Marchmont that 'the only other election, [Newcastle] had interested himself in, was Mr. Mitchell, whom he thought fit, and an honest man; and he believed, he owed his election to the Duke of Argyle, who had made Sir Archibald Grant drop it. He said, he had wrote to the Advocate [Robert Craigie, a Squadrone supporter] about it'.[154]

---

[146] Alexander Murdoch, 'Scotland and the union', in Dickinson, ed, *A companion to eighteenth-century Britain*, p. 386.
[147] Jeremy Black, *The politics of Britain 1688-1800* (Manchester and New York, 1993), p. 37.
[148] Mitchell to Newcastle, 18 July 1747, BL Add MS 58283, f. 6. As Ilay's Scottish agent Milton also had a say in appointments. See Shaw, *The political history of eighteenth-century Scotland*, p. 31.
[149] Jeremy Black, *Eighteenth-century Britain 1688-1783* (Houndmills and London, 2001), p. 246.
[150] Mitchell to Newcastle, 13 July 1747, in Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 1, pp. 55-58.
[151] Mitchell to Argyll, 15 July 1747, BL Add. MS 58289, f. 115. As Doran has pointed out, Mitchell's refusal to allow more than attributing 'the ease & unanimity of my election to his Grace', and not an outright obligation, injured him in his hopes for re-election in Aberdeenshire in 1754, where he subsequently stood for Elgin Burghs with the help of his other friends. See Doran, *Andrew Mitchell*, p. 10, and Mitchell to Newcastle, 16 July 1747, BL Add. MS 59283, f. 6.
[152] Sir Archibald Grant had been expelled from Parliament over his involvement in theft of money from the Charitable Corporation designed to assist the poor. See Lenman, 'Scotland between the '15 and the '45', p. 81.
[153] William Grant to Sir Archibald Grant, 25 June 1747, in Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 1, p. 61.
[154] *A Selection from the Papers of the Earls of Marchmont, in the possession of The Right Honble Sir George Henry Rose, Illustrative of events from 1685 to 1750*, Vol. 1 (London, 1831), pp. 190, 250.

The period 1747-1751 was a period of relative stability in parliamentary politics, highlighted by a relative lack of attendance in the Parliament.[155] It contrasted sharply to the highly divisive times ahead, when 'upper-class folly, effeminacy, bribery, and favouritism' were represented in popular prints.[156] Indeed, Mitchell's parliamentary tenure (when in Britain) falls almost perfectly within what Bob Harris has argued were the most stable years of Whig rule in the middle of the century.[157] A minor complication, and one that involved Mitchell, was the death of Duncan Forbes in 1747, thus creating a contest for the vacant seat of Lord President of the Court of Session in Scotland. It once more demonstrated the delicate nature of Anglo-Scots patronage and loyalty, and shows that Mitchell was still alert to the threat of Ilay's control, as well as the need to negate it with partisan appointments.

Marchmont recorded in his diary a meeting with Newcastle over the vacant appointment of Lord President.[158] In a conversation with Newcastle, Marchmont was asked about possible successors to Duncan Forbes as Lord President. Marchmont suggested Robert Dundas, Lord Arniston as he was a large landowner and might be affronted not to be considered – but more importantly, that he was not under the power of Ilay (Argyll). Marchmont said Arniston would be the most amenable to the English ministers. Newcastle said that was strange, for two days ago, Mitchell sat with him and said that one Charles Areskine would be the most 'unexceptionable of the Duke of Argyle's [sic] people to the opposite party'. Marchmont replied, 'Mr. Mitchell might mean what he pleased by parties; I considered them not; my doctrine was to encourage the friends to the King, and to the English ministers, and I did not think Areskine one. [Newcastle] said, they did not think so of him here [in London]; and he would tell me, that the King, speaking of the President's death, had named Areskine; but that [Newcastle] himself had recommended nobody, he did assure me'. Newcastle asked who then would be best from the Argyll faction, and asked Marchmont's opinion of other candidates. That evening Marchmont dined with Chesterfield where the latter also endorsed Areskine, and although the appointment collapsed due to concerns over Areskine's allegiances, it does demonstrate Newcastle's immediate interest in Mitchell's opinions on Scottish appointments, and the development of an implicit political trust.

An issue which allowed Mitchell to make a brief appearance in the spotlight was also one in which his complex relationship to his homeland of Scotland complicated his political loyalties. Like the Jacobite threats in 1715 and 1745, the Mutiny Bill that allowed Mitchell to make his strongest parliamentary stand had its origins in the 1717-18 debates over the same issues of penalties and court martials, and standing

---

[155] Black, *Eighteenth-century Britain*, p. 247.
[156] Newman, *The rise of English nationalism*, p. i.
[157] Harris argues that 1742-46, and 1754-57 'saw acute governmental instability'. See Bob Harris, *Politics and the nation: Britain in the mid-eighteenth century* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 23, 28.
[158] Marchmont's meetings with Newcastle and Chesterfield recorded in *A Selection from the Papers of the Earls of Marchmont*, vol. 1, pp. 25-253. For Areskine's record, see Romney Sedgwick, 'Areskine, Charles (1680-1763), of Tinwald and Barjarg, Dumfries, and Alva, Stirling (now in Clackmannan)', at http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1715-1754/member/areskine-charles-1680-1763), accessed 15 August 2018.

armies, as those that arose in the the Commons in 1749.[159] The Mutiny Bill debates had their origins in the review of standards in the military code launched by the Duke of Cumberland, but was closely linked to parliamentary politics in other ways. When the Bill reached debate in Parliament in 1751, it stirred Andrew Mitchell to make one of only two known speeches by him.[160] Lacking incentive or political pressure, most MPs in this period spoke rarely if at all, usually only rising to speak if spurred by 'specialist knowledge, vested interests or personal prejudice'.[161] Thus, it brings to light some issues concerning Newcastle's grip on his client politicians and Scotland.

The debate on the Mutiny Bill in 1751 consisted of two main areas: whether commanding officers or courts martial should be equipped to try non-commissioned officers and private officers, and whether a militia should replace a standing army. It was part of a long-running feud punctuated by intense enmity between George Townshend and the Duke of Cumberland, and was to complicate what was generally an annual passing of Mutiny Acts without disturbance.[162] It was also part of a larger pattern of protection that could have been fostered from within army command to protect both its reputation and the independence of its operations,[163] and formed part of a larger discussion about civilian versus military punishments.[164] According to Horace Walpole, who is also the source of comment on Mitchell's speech on the Mutiny Bill of 1751, the Duke of Cumberland sought to impose stricter disciplines in the new military code. Some took note of this, and it became conjoined to a discussion about the treatment of Sir Henry Erskine by a superior, General Anstruther, in Minorca some years before.[165]

There are two things to be noted: first, Anstruther had long been loathed by Scots because of his outspoken support of punishments imposed on Edinburgh after the Porteous Riot; second, Mitchell was familiar to him, as he had written a letter via Anstruther in 1737.[166] The latter is a circumstance partially explaining why Mitchell might have risen to speak; the former formed a section of ongoing political division to which Mitchell had earlier been privy. That the evolving debate over the potential prosecution of Anstruther hinged around military law no doubt was also of interest to Mitchell. As part of his study for the bar he had accumulated substantial amounts of his own written notes, concerning contemporary legal cases and case studies.[167] It was part of a growing trend of Scots adapting to English law, finding that they

---

[159] See Lenman, 'Scotland between the '15 and the '45', p. 87.
[160] Mitchell is recorded as having spoken in favour of the Sheriff Depute Bill in 1755, pushed through Parliament by Newcastle, which allowed Parliament to continue the office tenure of Sheriffs Depute at their pleasure. This was seen as a control measure by opposition in parliament. See Clark, *Dynamics of change*, pp. 142 and n309, 310.
[161] P. D. G. Thomas, *The House of Commons in the eighteenth century* (Oxford, 1971), p. 231.
[162] John Miller, *Early modern Britain, 1450-1750* (Cambridge, 2017), p. 433.
[163] Douglas M. Peers, 'Army discipline, military cultures, and state-formation' in H. V. Bowen, Elizabeth Mancke, and John G. Reid, eds, *Britain's oceanic empire: Atlantic and Indian Ocean worlds, c. 1550-1850* (Cambridge, 2012), pp. 286-287.
[164] John Brewer, *The sinews of power: War, money, and the English state, 1688-1783* (London, Boston, Sydney and Wellington, 1989), pp. 47-48.
[165] Horace Walpole, *Memoires of the last ten years of the reign of George the Second,* Vol. 1 (London, 1823), pp. 32-35.
[166] For the Porteous Riot, see the beginning of Part v of this chapter; for the letter via Anstruther, see BL Add. MS 58293, f. 10.
[167] 'Notes on legal cases', Mitchell Papers, BL Add MS 58324.

could use their interests in civil law and the law of nations to reconcile Scots law with English law, and to embrace the latter more fully.[168] It is perhaps also worth noting that Mitchell was part of an exclusive club of Scots that took the bar, were members of the Inns of Court, and who also became MPs. Allied with his interest in English law, which was in line with growing legal trends embodied by Scots, then there can be a more complete explanation of Mitchell's clear interest in this case.[169] At its core, however, the Anstruther debate was political. Who was to blame for the punishment meted out to Edinburgh in the aftermath of the Porteous Riot, and which interests legimitately held sway in Scotland? Horace Walpole wrote that 'Anstruther has mutually persecuted and been persecuted by the Scotch ever since Porteous's affair, when, of all that nation, he alone voted for demolishing part of Edinburgh'. Walpole added that 'this affair would be a trifle, if it had not opened the long-smothered rivalship between Fox and Pitt' and informed the recipient that it had endangered both Newcastle's grip on power and the balance of alliances between those devoted to the Prince of Wales and those to Cumberland.[170]

A history of hatred followed Anstruther since his controversial vote, and his military command of Minorca had also been closely scrutinised and found wanting. Declining morale, seemingly fermented by his absence and, when present, his harsh discipline and corrupt practices, brought him under public scrutiny. He survived a House of Lords enquiry but returned to punish his accusers in Minorca. He arrested (but subsequently freed) a subordinate officer in Sir Henry Erskine and, in the later years of the 1740s, by which time he had returned to Parliament, he faced recriminations by those he had abused, including Erskine. Political sides were quickly drawn: Fox took the side of Anstruther, and Pitt sided with Erskine and a parliamentary enquiry.[171] Anstruther also had the support of the Pelhams, who had used their influence to have him elected in 1747.

Mitchell won the confidence of Newcastle and Pelham through demonstrations of political loyalty, and he was rewarded with Newcastle's support in rising to Parliament. Thus when Newcastle was attacked in Parliament over the Anstruther affair, and the key debate in March 1751 was whether the Privy Council could force Anstruther to answer for his crimes in Minorca, or whether it was a matter for military court martial, Mitchell rose to speak on the issue. Horace Walpole recorded that George Townshend argued that the King should enforce the Privy Council command to punish Anstruther; Pitt also rose to support it. Rising for the government, Mitchell spoke against it.[172] His long-time friend George Lyttelton also spoke for the consistency of military discipline to be applied by the military alone, but to no avail.[173] That Mitchell

---

[168] John W. Cairns, *Law, lawyers, and humanism: Selected essays on the history of Scots law*, Vol. 1 (Edinburgh, 2015), pp. 113-114.
[169] *Ibid.*, p. 91n17.
[170] Horace Walpole to Horace Mann, 13 March 1751, in *The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence*, Vol. 20 (New Haven, 1937-1983), p. 230.
[171] J. M. Simpson and R. S. Lea, 'Anstruther, Philip (c. 1680-1760), of Airdrie, Fife', in *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1715-1754*, ed. R. Sedgwick (1970), at http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1715-1754/member/anstruther-philip-1680-1760, accessed 2 November 2017.
[172] Horace Walpole, *Memoirs of the reign of George the Second*, Vol. 1 (London, 1846), p. 95.
[173] *The history, debates, and proceedings of both Houses of Parliament of Great Britain, from the year 1743 to the year 1774*, Vol. 3 (London, 1792), pp. 64-70.

did rise against the motion was, once and for all, a full demonstration of his loyalty to Newcastle, evidenced through an open opposition to the King's will. While Anstruther escaped further punishment due to the Act of Indemnity of 1747, the case was not truly settled until Erskine beat Anstruther in the election of 1753. Recalling Anstruther's part in the Edinburgh persecution and probably the other aspects recounted here, David Hume thought it 'delicious revenge', adding that 'I never can hope to hate any body so perfectly as I hate that renown'd Commander: And no Victory, Triumph, Vengeance, Success, can be more compleat [sic]'.[174] The contest over Anstruther's seat was and remained crucial to the operation of politics in Westminster, and Mitchell had shown his dedication to the ministry's interests once more in the 1751 debate. When, in 1752, Mitchell 'taxed old Horace Walpole on his unparliamentary behaviour, in speaking on one side and voting on the other', he could point to his own history of enacting, for better or worse, his parliamentary loyalties.[175] We cannot know for certain the effect of Mitchell's speech on the Anstruther affair, or that against old Horace Walpole, but despite the dearth of records that might give any certainty on this point, the two mentions of Mitchell speaking in parliament certainly puts him well in the realm of the more active parliamentarians. Reading records of parliamentary debates during the period 1768-1774, for example, most parliamentarians did not speak at all during their tenure, and only around forty-four percent spoke once.[176] Mitchell continued in Parliament serving his Aberdeenshire seat until the elections of 1754, when he was obliged to surrender his seat. Doran attributes this to Mitchell's 'flaunting of his independence' from Argyll and his followers.[177] In Chapter 2 I alluded to Murdoch's statement that Mitchell was a father figure to his friends. Murdoch made this comment in allusion to Mitchell's virtue in the face of this political setback. Murdoch told his correspondent John Forbes:

> In whatever manner the great follks behave to him, I defy them to make him unhappy, as long as Virtue, and Conscience, and Character can support a Man … His honesty, and superior talents for business, are acknowledged and admired; and what he is in private life you and I best know. Has he not been as a father to us both? The same to McLaurin's family, to Thomson, and of late to Warrender; and to many others we never heard of? And all with a narrow fortune, and moving in an inferior sphere.[178]

[174] David Hume to John Clephane, 28 October 1753, in J. Y. T. Grieg, ed, *The Letters of David Hume*, Vol. 1, *1727-1765* (Oxford, 1932), p. 181.
[175] Walpole, *Memoirs*, 29 April 1752, Vol. 1, p. 222.
[176] Thomas, *The House of Commons*, p. 229.
[177] Doran, *Andrew Mitchell*, p. 10.
[178] Murdoch to John Forbes, 16 May 1754, *Culloden Papers*, p. 311.

Murdoch then compared Mitchell to the titular character in Samuel Richardson's *Sir Charles Grandison*, published the previous year in 1753, and continued to extoll the political abilities which made Mitchell indispensable to the current ministry, while at the same time singling out Ilay (Argyll) for censure.

> There are, no doubt, many Gentlemen of great worth in that house both from this side of the Tweed, and from yours; but none his superior in all the essential qualifications of a senator: and it will do no honour to the Politicians concerned, to see him sacrificed to the mean resentments of a man whom nobody loves, and who visibly derives his importance from the weakness and indolence of others.[179]

With discussions over a possible formation of a Scottish ministry in the mid 1750s extinguished, so too was the final remnants of the Squadrone.[180] Mitchell was subsequently returned in 1755 for Elgin Burghs, through the promotion of the incumbent, William Grant, to a higher Scottish political office, and the support of Mitchell's friends and patrons James Ogilvy, 5th Earl of Findlater, George Burnett of Kemnay, and, later, the Earl Marischal. He was urged to maintain relations those possibly angered at the manner of his election by Findlater, particularly in setting the earl of Kintore back to Mitchell's side.[181] He did not, as in 1747, have to rely on the acquiescence of Argyll or to write to thank him.

v. Beginnings of diplomacy: Mitchell in Brussels

Earlier in this chapter I outlined the background legal training that Mitchell received in the law of nations, and Grotius in particular. Mitchell's solid political performances, trustworthiness, and background in law, combined with this former point, must have put him in Newcastle's mind as a potential candidate for further promotion. Whether it was fortuitous timing or a planned move, Britain's commitment to attending re-negotiations on the 1715 Barrier Treaty in Brussels chimed perfectly with Mitchell's career arc at this point. Mitchell attending the treaty renegotiations sat perfectly within the triumvirate of interests that Kathleen Wilson has identified in her book *The sense of the people*. 'In the 1740s and 1750s', Wilson argues, 'trade and empire, the nature of the national character, and the relationship of all three to Britain's political leadership were potent, and related, issues in and out of Parliament'. Moreover, the success of Mitchell's

[179] *Ibid.*
[180] Emerson, *Academic patronage*, p. 131.
[181] Earl of Findlater to Mitchell, 4 January 1755, BL Add MS 58291, f. 1.

mission was all the more important for Newcastle and him because, as Wilson states, the 'increasingly vociferous political public' would be closely watching.[182]

The 'Treaty of the Barrier' had been concluded in 1715, and involved Britain, Austria, and the United Provinces. It was, according to Matt Schumann and Karl W. Schweizer, 'the oldest and most fundamental agreement between London and Vienna'. Hamish Scott gives it a more distinct appraisal: 'The centrepiece of the Old System, the hinge on which it turned, was the Barrier in the Low Countries'.[183] Schumann and Schweizer note that treaty was both commercial and military, literally involving a military barrier along the Dutch-French border but also complex subsidies and commercial arrangements between the states.[184] Mitchell's negotiations seem primarily to have centred upon the trade aspects of the treaty, and these were also somewhat Newcastle's focus in early 1752. Newcastle wrote to Britain's ambassador Robert Keith in Vienna, emphasising the importance of maintaining the Austrian alliance and overcoming the Austrians' reservedness.

> You must insist upon it that Austria shall come to an understanding with England and Holland respecting the Barrier Treaty. Upon the principle there can be no dispute. The execution of the treaty from both sides, and the settling everything that relates to the Low Countries upon an amicable footing, is so material, that, till that is done, there will always remain such causes of jealousy and discontent as will not fail to affect that perfect union and harmony which is so necessary between the maritime powers and England.[185]

There were other factors at play, which included the election of Austria's Joseph II as King of the Romans, and the early death of the Dutch Stadtholder William IV in the Netherlands, whose widow was the daughter of George II.[186] Newcastle's primary objectives when coming to his prime office were, according to Clark, those begun by his deceased brother Henry Pelham: 'a dependence on the Austrian alliance, the Barrier, and treaties with minor German states as the only counterpoise to French power'.[187] As Hamish Scott has noted, these points were tightly interwoven. The latter symbolised Britain's interest in the past and future of the Dutch Republic, which meant that having Joseph elected as King of the Romans would not only secure Newcastle's treasured 'Old System' of alliances, it would also provide extra

---

[182] Wilson, *The sense of the people*, p. 139.
[183] Scott, *British foreign*, pp. 44-45.
[184] Matt Schumann and Karl W. Schweizer, *The Seven Years War: A transatlantic history* (London and New York, 2008), pp. 34-35.
[185] Newcastle to Keith, 26 November 1751, cf. Frederick von Raumer, *Contributions to modern history, from the British Museum and the State Paper Office: Frederick II and his times* (London, 1837), pp. 202-203.
[186] The 'Imperial Election Scheme' and its factors are discussed at length in Jeremy Black, *British politics and foreign policy, 1744-1757: Mid-century crisis* (London and New York, 2015), pp. 129-136.
[187] Clark, *The dynamics of change*, p. 68.

incentive to maintain the 1715 Barrier Treaty as part of these circumstances.[188] Thus Mitchell's mission in 1752 fell approximately in the middle of a longer problematic period for Austria, and, according to Brendan Simms, Britain prioritised reviving Austrian power with the Holy Roman Empire, which 'provided the politico-legal context within which the integrity of the Barrier could be defended'.[189]

The King confirmed the choice of Mitchell to act for Britain in these negotiations, alongside the experienced British agent Solomon Dayrolles.[190] Mitchell knew Dayrolles from their membership of the Egyptian Society some sixteen years earlier.[191] However, Chesterfield told Dayrolles that Mitchell had not been first choice. It had, he said, been offered to a 'Tom Page', 'whom I suppose you know; but he refused it: now I believe it will be Mr. Mitchell, a Scotch member of parliament; he is a sensible good sort of man, and easy to live with'.[192] Mitchell confirmed his appointment to Joseph Yorke in The Hague sometime later.[193] Dayrolles was the perfect counterpart for Mitchell at this juncture: Chesterfield had said of Dayrolles that he 'knows everything, he haunts the great, and he is the faithful depository of all their secrets', adding that 'you only have to tell him what Barrier and what tariff you want, and he will give them to you'.[194] It was a vital vote of confidence in Mitchell's ability on the part of both the King and Newcastle. Mitchell added in a later sidenote that 'it is with the most sincere gratitude that I acknowledge the favours your Grace has conferred on me', and that Mitchell begged 'the continuance of Your Grace's protection and indulgence'.[195] Hugh Valence Jones, Undersecretary of State to Newcastle and a man privy to the opinions of the ministry, told Mitchell that he had been chosen 'so much to the general Satisfaction' of all.[196] Mitchell arrived in Brussels on 28 March 1752 but, though unofficial discussions had begun in late April, official negotiations did not commence until 5 May, due to various delays on the part of Austria.[197] Newcastle informed him that he himself would be stopping in Brussels en route to Hanover, and tasked Mitchell with gathering the best insights possible from discussions with the Austrians related to a treaty of commerce regarding the Barrier, before reiterating his annoyance at Austrian prevarications and neglect.[198] Before negotiations could even commence, Mitchell learned extremely valuable protocol and ceremonial aspects

---

[188] Scott, "The true principles of the Revolution', p. 73 passim.
[189] Simms, *Three victories and a defeat*, p. 357.
[190] 'Commission of George II. appointing S. Dayrolle and A. Mitchell joint Commissaries at Brussels, for the settlement of the Barrier Treaty', BL Add MS 15873, f. 218.
[191] Minute Book of the Egyptian Society, BL Add MS 52362, f. 4v.
[192] Chesterfield to Dayrolles, 7 February 1752 (OS), in M. Maty, ed, *Miscellaneous works of the late Philip Dormer Stanhope, earl of Chesterfield*, Vol. 3 (Dublin, 1777), p. 231. Tom Page has proven elusive but he is mentioned as Secretary of the Treasury in R. S. Turner, ed, *Horace Walpole's marginal notes, written in Dr. Maty's Miscellaneous Works and Memoirs of the Earl of Chesterfield* (place and date of publication unknown), p. 79.
[193] Mitchell to Joseph Yorke, undated draft (probably early March 1752), BL Add MS 58283, f. 7.
[194] Chesterfield to Anthony de Huybert, Baron de Kreuningen, 3 November 1751 (OS), in Lord Mahon, ed, *The letters of Philip Dormer Stanhope, earl of Chesterfield*, Vol. 3 (London, 1845), p. 443. Kreuningen was a Counsellor in the High Court of Justice in the Dutch Republic, and probably privy to negotiations. The French: 'Il est au fait de tout, il hante les grands, et il est le fidèle dépositaire de tous leurs secrets'. 'vous n'avez qu'à lui dire quelle Barrière et quel Tarif vous souhaitez, et il vous les donnera'.
[195] Mitchell to Newcastle, 22/17 March 1752, BL Add MS 58283, f. 12.
[196] Hugh Valence Jones to Mitchell, 16 March 1752, BL Add MS 58283, f. 8.
[197] Mitchell reported the opening of formal discussions to Holdernesse on 5 May/24 April 1752, BL Add MS 58284, f. 2.
[198] Newcastle to Mitchell, 16 March 1752, BL Add MS 58283, ff. 10-11.

which grew his awareness of the world of diplomacy. He was careful to avoid any wrong steps in this new world, and avoided associating with exiled Scottish Jacobites in Brussels. One such exile, Andrew Hay, noted that Mitchell did not return their calling cards, and later when 'we met with Mr. Mitchell att the Comedy, he did not choose to take any notice of us'.[199] He also dined with Prince Charles of Lorraine and the Austrian plenipotentiary, the Marquis de Botta. The latter told Mitchell that Vienna disapproved of the commercial mismanagement of the Dutch Republic.[200] Newcastle likewise reported some intransigence of the part of de Botta, an a general apathy toward negotiations on the part of Austria.[201] In 1751, Chesterfield had also told Dayrolles not to mind if he got into any 'scrapes' with de Botta, 'as he is not in very good odour here'.[202]

Austria's prevarications stemmed partly from their understanding that the subsidies paid by them to maintain protections of the Austrian Netherlands were not being properly used. Mitchell joined with the Dutch commissaries in demanding full payment of the Austrian subsidy, which, Newcastle informed Mitchell, the King had approved.[203] Negotiations were difficult, and one occasion Mitchell and Dayrolles were reprimanded for taking too much initiative into their own hands in tandem with the Dutch commissaries,[204] however Mitchell put this down to the errors and miscommunications of Yorke.[205] Chesterfield reiterated to Dayrolles the importance of getting behind the Dutch, who were most immediately affected by negotiations, and that, in his belief, negotiations would take a back seat to other politics for some time.[206] Henry Pelham told Newcastle that as trade was of great interest to many, progress in that regard would be difficult. 'These are not times, in my opinion, to look out for new systems, or new expedients; if we can keep the old ones upon a good footing, it is all we have to expect, or desire', he told Newcastle. He added 'I fear you will have greater difficulties in your negotiations at Brussels, than upon the point of election [of the King of the Romans]'.[207] Newcastle largely directed negotiations from London, and for much of his mission Mitchell was hampered by the delays in relaying messages to London, and waiting for Austrian responses. Charles Hanbury Williams, in discussion with Kaunitz at Vienna, seemed to confirm this when he told Newcatle that Kaunitz had different intentions for both the Barrier Treaty itself, and where it should be negotiated. Kaunitz, Williams wrote, evidently thought that negotiations would be better for Austria were they held in Vienna.[208] Kaunitz himself supported continued negotiations because he perceived that solidifying Austria's relationship to Britain and the Dutch Republic was the most

[199] Alistair Norwich Tayler and Henrietta Tayler, *A Jacobite exile* (London, 1937), p. 66. However, Mitchell is supposed to have supported Hay's earlier petition for forgiveness, sent to George II in 1747. See *idem.*, p. 22.
[200] Mitchell to Newcastle, 22/17 March 1752, BL Add MS 58283, f. 12.
[201] Newcastle to Mitchell and Dayrolles, 13/24 April 1752, BL Add MS 58283, f. 35.
[202] Chesterfield to Dayrolles, 6 December 1751 (OS), in Maty, ed, *Miscellaneous works*, Vol. 3, p. 229.
[203] Newcastle to Mitchell and Dayrolles, 8/19 May 1752, BL Add MS 58283, f. 57.
[204] Newcastle to Mitchell and Dayrolles, 11 June 1752, BL Add MS 58283, f. 90.
[205] Mitchell and Dayrolles to Yorke, 15 June 1752, BL Add MS 58283, ff. 92-96.
[206] Chesterfield to Dayrolles, 17 March 1752 (OS), in Maty, ed, *Miscellaneous works,* Vol. 3, pp. 232-233.
[207] Pelham to Newcastle, 1/12 May 1752, in William Coxe, ed, *Memoirs of the administration of the right honourable Henry Pelham, collected from the family papers, and other authentic documents*, Vol. 2 (London, 1829), p. 415.
[208] Charles Hanbury Williams to Newcastle, 15 July 1753, in *Ibid.*, p. 482.

expeditious given the overall diplomatic situation, but he was pessimistic about success in the Barrier negotiations and attributed this to the Dutch government.[209]

Mitchell met Kaunitz when the latter arrived in Brussels in early 1753. Kaunitz immediately impressed upon Prince Charles of Lorraine, de Botta, the supreme counsellor Patrice-François de Neny, and others, the urgency of concluding a new agreement to maintain the system of alliance with the Maritime Powers.[210] Kaunitz would later recall Mitchell fondly, but no verbatim account of their conversations exists (see Chapter 4). Mitchell, informed of events by Newcastle only as far as they concerned Mitchell's negotiations, returned home in the second half of 1753 to attend parliament and his own affairs. The difficulties he faced in opposing the Argyll factions in Aberdeenshire during his first parliamentary term meant that Mitchell did not run for the seat at the 1754 election. He unsuccessfully sought the post of Lord Lyon King of Arms, but the interest of friends and patrons the earl of Findlater, George Burnett of Kemnay, and the Earl Marischall saw him elected safely to the Elgin Burghs in 1755 when the incumbent was promoted in Scotland. Proposed as a potential Ambassador to Vienna, Mitchell was eventually sent to Prussia the following year.[211]

vi. Conclusion

This chapter has sought to explain the origins and nature of Mitchell's political and intellectual alignments. Mitchell was educated, like many other young Scots, in both the Dutch Republic as well as in his native country. His teachers, namely Charles Mackie and George Turnbull, imbued him with the scepticism which he was later to bring to bear on his parliamentary career, and which also exposed him to the strong intellectual links that Scotland, and Britain, shared with Europe. The political affiliations formed at Edinburgh were to place Mitchell in a strong position upon his return to London. While he could benefit from friendships already forged before his Grand Tour, and their extension to new friendships, it was his own work in attaining the English bar that placed him in the eyes of men of influence. His own assiduity in studying early modern law, constitutional law, and finance, prepared him for commencement as Tweeddale's private secretary, and when that man ascended to Secretary of State for Scotland, Mitchell became Undersecretary. Mitchell's choice of political allegiance, while understandably Whig as many Scots were, was also a pragmatic choice by attaching himself to the Squadrone interest. It was, however, by no means smooth sailing. Until the strengthening of Pelham and Newcastle's patronage interests – particularly those of the latter – Argyll and his brother Ilay did not make Anglo-Scots political cooperation a simple

[209] William J. McGill, 'The Roots of Policy: Kaunitz in Vienna and Versailles, 1749-1753', *The Journal of Modern History*, 43 (1971), pp. 228-244.
[210] Michele Galand, 'Le subside de la Barrière après la guerre de Succession d'Autriche: 'L'affaire des Quatorze cent mille florins", *Revue belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, 67 (1989), p. 286.
[211] Doran, *Andrew Mitchell*, pp. 9-10.

affair. This chapter, then, has sought to bring greater notice to Mitchell's time as Undersecretary: the volume of work he took on, particularly in light of condemnation of Tweeddale by historians, now appears even more conspicuous; his ability to remain in Newcastle's favour, thereby enabling his move into Parliament, appears to have been well managed.

Mitchell came into Parliament at a point of relatively lower tensions – despite the settlement from the '45 – but made himself known by opposing the motion to punish Philip Anstruther by rule of the Privy Council. While we do not know the substance of his speech, the timing and the loaded political context show Mitchell to have been unafraid of speaking on behalf of his party, and his friends' political interest. That he was noted by Horace Walpole as bringing Walpole's uncle to account in Parliament – and escaped any biting remark from Walpole's famous pen – shows him to have also been astute in his observations. He remained committed to improving his knowledge of trade and political affairs, navigating the road to greater office that he himself stated as his mission. The next chapter discusses Mitchell in Berlin, where he was posted after some four years working between Brussels and London on a re-negotiation of the 1715 Barrier Treaty, having been unsuccessful in his attempts at the domestic position of Lord Lyon King of Arms, and, abroad, as Ambassador to Vienna. Newcastle's proposal of Mitchell to fill these positions reaffirms his desire to place a strong and sympathetic Whig in key positions, particularly in relation to Vienna, where the Duke was struggling to maintain his alliance with Vienna under the 'Old System'.[212] Mitchell's appointment to Berlin was a further commitment by Newcastle to Mitchell's career.

[212] Black has noted how the parliamentary system was recognised as being of great assistance to foreign policy, and could be applied in this case. See Jeremy Black, 'Foreign policy and the British state 1742-1793', in Jeremy Black, ed, *British politics and society from Walpole to Pitt 1742-1789* (London, 1990), p. 163.

Chapter 4

Mitchell and the growth of an intellectual network between Berlin and Britain

i. Introduction

With the sensational Diplomatic Revolution of 1756 the 'Old System' of alliances so carefully cultivated by the Duke of Newcastle collapsed. It saw traditional enemies France and Austria forge an alliance against Britain and Prussia. In the midst of this important realignment in European politics, Andrew Mitchell left London for Berlin on 18 April 1756, and arrived on 8 May 1756. On arrival, he immediately presented his credentials to Count Podewils, one of Frederick's key diplomatic liaisons, and was well received shortly thereafter by Frederick himself. Indeed, as Mitchell noted, Frederick asked him to linger at Potsdam for some days, which was a cause for speculation back in Berlin.[1] The immediate friendship and mutual respect between the pair was to be only part of a complex diplomatic and intellectual relationship that developed over the following fifteen years (although 1766-1771 lacked the warmth of previous years). This chapter explores how, commencing with Frederick and growing ever wider and deeper, Andrew Mitchell set about creating an intellectual network in Prussia. Its exploration gives vital context, background, and rationale to the main cultural and diplomatic elements of the remaining chapters.

This chapter explores politics only in so far as it relates to Mitchell's diplomacy and his cultural interactions in Prussia. Patrick Francis Doran, in his examination of Mitchell and Anglo-Prussian political relations during the Seven Years War, has paid more than ample attention to the political side of Mitchell's career. Nevertheless, the political situation was ever-present in any cultural consideration, and this remains true in this chapter. Adding to Doran's work, this chapter argues that Mitchell's cultural activities played an important role in his conduct of diplomacy. That process began with winning the personal favour of Frederick.

First, this chapter will explore how and where Mitchell cultivated this network, and determines the context of this growth in his early Berlin years. Following this, the chapter takes a more specific approach to Mitchell's intellectual pursuits by examining his involvement with the Berlin Academy of Sciences and Belles Lettres and its members. It explores the interplay of knowledge, politics, and diplomacy. Its aim is

[1] For the departure date, see Doran, *Andrew Mitchell*, p. 50; for his arrival, and the recounting of his first experiences, see Mitchell to Holdernesse, 14 May 1756, BL Add MS 58284, f. 7r.

to add new information to this unexplored area of British diplomacy in Prussia, and the cultural life of Andrew Mitchell in particular. Lastly, the chapter explores the examples of Mitchell's participation in a network of information and correspondence despite the constraints of wartime campaigning. Since Chapters 2 and 3 explored the *how* and the *why* of Mitchell's interest in intellectual and political networks and societies, this chapter adds two key questions: Firstly, how could he, and why did he, decide to cultivate knowledge networks in a foreign land, with a foreign academy? Secondly, in what ways did this enhance or detract from his ability to conduct British diplomatic affairs in Prussia? The contention of this chapter is that Mitchell, firstly, cultivated an intellectual network in Prussia by utilising the cultural outlets it provided as a means to access politically-minded contacts. It approaches the core elements of his engagements on those two fronts in order to bring definition to the vague outlines provided by previous examiners of Mitchell's Berlin career. In the final section, this chapter utilises a prosopographical approach to highlight these core themes further. Diplomacy with a blend of cultural politics is something that Mitchell utilised to increase the security of Britain's position with Frederick and Prussia.

ii. **Mitchell in Prussia: The Diplomatic Revolution**

Andrew Mitchell arrived in Berlin in the wake of the biggest shift in European diplomatic alliances in centuries. Frederick II of Prussia now saw Austria, his main enemy, in alliance with France. The alliance of these two states changed the landscape of diplomacy between them which had been unaltered since the end of the fifteenth century.[2] Choiseul, chief minister in France, was later to observe that 'all [French] resources were enthusiastically and unthinkingly deployed in support of a land war, the aim of which was to benefit the House of Austria'.[3] The alliance of France with Austria had come about due to many converging factors. Brendan Simms has argued that one of the key moments that sealed Austria's estrangement from Britain was the latter's Convention of Westminster, signed with Prussia, in which Britain also sought protection for Hanover. As Simms notes, this agreement alienated Britain from Austria and Russia, as well as moving more quickly towards a greater conflict with France.[4] In short, the Convention of Westminster was interpreted by Austria and Russia as an affront to their diplomatic relations with Britain. It solidified the break between Frederick and France, and brought Russia into a fortuitous alliance with France, on top of Russia's already-existing alliance with Austria. Even though it was not always a harmonious union of states, their common aim was to defeat Frederick and Prussia.[5] In sum, the mutual isolation of Britain and Prussia brought them together and probably explains, almost in its entirety, Frederick's enthusiastic reception of Mitchell. Frederick had Austria, France, and Russia ranged against

[2] Scott, *The birth of a great power system*, p. 81.
[3] Simms, *Three victories and a defeat*, p. 508.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 408.
[5] Scott, *The emergence of the eastern powers,* pp. 29, 36-37.

him; Britain faced France in Europe and North America, and now also Austria and Russia in Europe.[6] Hamish Scott notes the perpetual difficulties in accessing the inner circle of Prussian diplomacy, not only for British diplomats, but all diplomats. 'The one diplomat who broke through the iron curtain which surrounded the principal cabinet secretary [Eichel] was … Andrew Mitchell', Scott writes, adding that even then, this was only possible because 'Prussia was isolated and desperate for British support, and as a result Britain's representative was admitted to the innermost councils of the Prussian state'.[7] Not even Frederick's nominal foreign minister Podewils could say that same for the majority of his tenure.[8] Thus, the Diplomatic Revolution and its immediate circumstances, cemented in the first Treaty of Versailles in 1756, is integral and forms a vital backdrop when discussing Mitchell's successes and close relationship to Frederick in the ensuing pages.[9] It also contributes to the question, addressed later in this thesis, of whether Mitchell's cultural diplomacy could overcome the pragmatic 'realpolitik' necessary to help Britain and Prussia navigate the Seven Years' War.

Mitchell's diplomatic instructions for his mission to Prussia were to form a strong relationship with Frederick, to discover his future plans, and of course, to make observations on Frederick's relations with France.[10] Michell, the Prussian envoy in London, had written to Frederick, notifying him of the choice of Mitchell to go to Prussia, introducing him as a man of wit and character, very attached to the present ministry and with a great knowledge of affairs.[11] In the early months of his tenure in Berlin, Mitchell had been a frequent guest of Frederick at the Town Palace (Stadtschloss) in Potsdam and Sans Souci, a privilege not even Frederick's wife enjoyed; she saw Sans Souci but once, passing by while being evacuated from Berlin, and was also barred from the Town Palace in Potsdam.[12] Mitchell caused speculation around the court when he spent the first two days after his arrival in Berlin at at the Town Palace.[13] This was seemingly internal speculation as, Mitchell added, 'I have yet seen none of the foreign Ministers', but he was 'highly pleased with the Manner in which I have been received by the King of Prussia'.[14] He was then frequently invited on matters of business or to watch a troop review, but there is no evidence that he discussed intellectual or philosophical matters with Frederick.[15] On Mitchell's arrival in Berlin, Podewils reported to Frederick's elusive minister Eichel that 'Sir Mitchell appears to be a frank and sincere man, fairly put

---

[6] Scott, *British foreign policy*, p. 33.
[7] Scott, 'Prussia's royal foreign minister', p. 514.
[8] Brendan Simms, *The impact of Napoleon: Prussian high politics, foreign policy and the crisis of the executive, 1797-1806* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 39.
[9] An in-depth survey of the beginnings of the Diplomatic Revolution can be found in Scott, *The birth of a great power system*, pp. 81-92. Brendan Simms provides an interesting, but short, account which argues that Britain was perhaps culpable in part for the Diplomatic Revolution by assuming that Franco-Austrian alliance was an eternal impossibility, and, moreover, that the British-Prussian Convention of Westminster would not affont any continental neighbours. See Simms, *Three victories and a defeat*, pp. 408-411.
[10] Doran, *Andrew Mitchell*, p. 50.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 33.
[12] Blanning, *Frederick the Great*, pp. 60, 435.
[13] Mitchell to Holdernesse, 14 May 1756, BL Add MS 58284, f. 7r.
[14] *Ibid.*, f. 8.
[15] Mitchell was at Potsdam to watch a troop review on 27 May 1756. See Mitchell to Holdernesse, 27 May 1756, BL Add. MS 58284, ff. 25-26.

together and open and full of good will', and while he spoke French well enough, Podewils said, it was with a strong English accent.[16] Podewils noted that Mitchell had expressed no concern over rumours of Franco-Austrian meetings, and that, in Britain at least, their concerns were confined to those nations influencing and possibly converting the Prince of Hesse-Cassel to Catholicism.[17] Frederick extended the invitation to this diplomat to whom he had taken a liking: 'Mitchell can come to Sanssouci, it will be quite pleasant for me', he wrote, and Mitchell arrived the following day. He went back later in July once more.[18] Mitchell's first contact in Berlin was Heinrich von Podewils, Foreign Minister to Frederick. However, as Frederick took the lead on foreign affairs, Podewils was in reality his 'royal master's ears and mouthpiece', as Hamish Scott has put it, and had 'no share in the formulation of Prussian policy and would frequently remain ignorant of Frederick's real intentions'.[19] Frederick had proven himself an inveterate meddler in foreign affairs, as Podewils had noted from long experience.[20] Thus in establishing a network in Prussia, and between Prussia and Britain, it was essential for Mitchell to first win Frederick's confidence and friendship.

In one early letter Mitchell gave Holdernesse a comprehensive explanation of his thoughts and opinions on Frederick and his own work to date at court. 'During my stay at Potsdam from Sunday to Tuesday night I had several opportunities of speaking with His Majesty, the substance of these conversations shall be the subject of this letter'.[21] Mitchell's first topic of conversation was Russia, on which front he assured Frederick that 'affairs at the Court of Petersburg were in a very good situation, I added that care would be taken they should continue so'. Britain's relationship with Russia had in reality been compromised as early as December 1755, when Empress Elizabeth informed Charles Hanbury Williams that, under the terms of the Russo-British subsidy treaty as she interpreted them, she would only use her troops against Prussia.[22] The Empress feared a Prussian attack, and reacted unfavourably to Prussian troop mobilisations in early 1756.[23] Britain's ministry, however, was of the belief that Russia would still honour their previous subsidy agreement. Mitchell reported that Frederick 'thought that the Peace of Germany could not be disturbed by any Power whatever, while Russia continued well disposed towards England, [and] that the greatest attention should be had to that Court, not only because of its instability, but that the French were actually endeavouring to get it out of our hands'. Tensions were fraught, as Mitchell noted, and Frederick opened his mind to Mitchell on the vulnerabilities of Prussia, situated as it was between France, Austria and Russia. Frederick explained that he would not justify his decision to receive the French envoy, the Duke de Nivernois, nor would he apologise for sending fresh representatives to Austria. Mitchell

[16] Podewils to Eichel, 10 May 1756, in *Politische Correspondenz Friedrichs des Grossen* (hereafter *Pol. Corr.*), Vol. 12 (Berlin, 1884), p. 319. The original French: Le sieur Mitchell paraît être un homme franc et sincere, assez uni et ouvert et plein de bonne volonté. Il parle assez bien, mais un français très fort prononcé à l'anglaise.
[17] *Ibid.*
[18] *Pol. Corr.*, Vol. 13, (Berlin, 1885), pp. 33, 97.
[19] Scott, 'Prussia's royal foreign minister', p. 508.
[20] Blanning recounts Frederick ferociously dressing Podewils down over supposed breaches of diplomatic protocol, of which Podewils ultimately proved innocent. See Blanning, *Frederick the Great*, pp. 129-130.
[21] Mitchell to Holdernesse 27 May 1756, BL Add MS 58284, ff. 27-32. All Mitchell quotes and paraphrases in this paragraph emerge from this letter unless otherwise noted.
[22] Herbert Kaplan, *Russia and the outbreak of the Seven Years' War* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1968), pp. 37-38.
[23] Simms, *Three victories and a defeat*, p. 408.

reported that Frederick did not wish for a general war and that Frederick wanted to maintain relations with France and believed that the Russians might very well come into Germany in order to fight on the side of Prussia. The uncertainty of the diplomatic situation is palpably clear, and Frederick still believed that France, if she were to lose out in America or at sea, would join wholeheartedly with Austria against Prussia. Mitchell showed his clear sense of the uncertainty of the diplomatic situation.

> In all the conversations I have had with the King or his Ministers I have carefully avoided saying any Thing that can possibly give offence either to the Courts of Vienna or Petersburg, and when harsh expressions have been used I have chose rather to soften them.

The conversations in the letter furthermore touched on France, their potential invasion of Britain, Britain's defence of its island, and the potential use of the Dutch Republic if a general alliance against Prussia were to be formed. Mitchell's awareness of the fragility of European relations was shown again three months earlier. Frederick told him that he would send an envoy to Russia if a mediation between Britain, Russia and Austria would have any effect. Meanwhile, Frederick had been making 'defensive' military manoeuvres. Mitchell felt the need to soften foreign interpretations of Frederick's conduct, and wrote accordingly to Williams in St Petersburg 'to prevent the first impressions that the Austrian and French factions at Petersburg will endeavour to make on the Russian ministry by misrepresenting the K. of P. conduct and putting it in the most favourable light'.[24] While the diplomatic situation necessitated Mitchell working closely with Frederick, in these early months, Mitchell's diplomacy reflected the reality that winning Frederick's personal favour was the key to the success of his mission.

Mitchell's letters fit the unique state of affairs but also show a great willingness on Frederick's part to move closer to Britain, more so as the letter outlines the great range of enemies ranged against him. Frederick comprehensively controlled his foreign policy and had had a mixed relationship with Britain's previous representatives to his court. His relationship with France until the Diplomatic Revolution of 1756 explains this to a large degree. However, Frederick was his own first minister, head of civil service and commander-in-chief of the army; in short, he was his own *Kabinett*.[25] Mitchell's predecessor in Berlin, Charles Hanbury Williams, had seen the writing on the wall when even Podewils would not say a word to him, and noted also that Podewils and his counterpart Finckenstein (who would take sole control of the position they both shared) knew as much about Prussian policy as what they read in the gazettes.[26] It was

[24] Mitchell to Holdernesse, 30 August 1756, BL Add MS 58285, f. 49.
[25] H. M. Scott, 'The rise of the first minister in eighteenth-century Europe', in T. C. W. Blanning & David Cannadine, eds, *History and biography: Essays in honour of Derek Beales* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 26-27.

[26] Horace Walpole, *Memoires of the last ten years of the reign of George the Second*, Vol. 1 (London, 1822), in *The Works of Horatio Walpole, Earl of Orford*, Vol. 7 (London, 1822), pp. 515, 519.

Frederick who felt slighted at Williams's conduct with the Poniatowski family of Poland, as well as Williams's friendship with Voltaire and the shunned Russian envoy to the Prussian court. Williams was frozen out: 'Nothing can make a worse figure than I do at this court', Williams had written, continuing, 'most people have orders not to visit me; the common civilities that are paid to other Ministers are not paid to me'. In sum, he felt he was 'look'd upon as a dangerous spy and an enemy to his Prussian Majesty's views, and treated accordingly'.[27] Soon after he arrived, Mitchell reported home that Frederick 'spoke of [Williams] with great moderation', but had again mentioned Williams' meddling with Grand Duchess Catherine of Russia, when Hanbury Williams became Ambassador to Russia, as having complicated all relations with Empress Elizabeth.[28] Williams' take on the affair of his demise was that Frederick held the true power in Prussian foreign policy, that he was 'the compleatest Tyrant that God ever sent for a scourge to an offending people', and that everyone in Britain and in respectable society could see that Williams himself was not at fault.[29] From Saxony, he was still writing to Mitchell asking him to meet Podewils and beg him to understand that he, Williams, never worked against Frederick.[30] It should have come as no surprise: Frederick had announced, upon taking power from his father, that 'I look upon the interests of the state as my own: I can have no interest which are not equally those of my people'.[31] Frederick was to maintain sole control of power, and this extended to diplomacy.[32] Mitchell had noted early on in his tenure that Frederick's plans were closely guarded, writing on one occasion that 'all this is only conjecture, as His Majesty's Intentions even in these small matters are known only to Himself'.[33] Frederick proved to be the key man when it came to setting the tone for Mitchell's diplomatic mission. This extended to the intellectual sphere.

Frederick viewed the intellectual capacities of his people as, first and foremost, a vehicle for service of the state. Practical application was privileged, particularly during the Seven Years' War when such fields of expertise as mathematics to improve weaponry, or chemical experimentation on behalf of the army, were deemed most vital.[34] This gave Frederick's Berlin Academy a strong practical dimension. The philosophical bent of the academy was, in the early Frederician years and particularly during the presidency of Maupertuis, largely 'eclectic', as Ronald S. Calinger has termed it, employing and considering a variety of philosophical methods encompassing Liebnizo-Wolffianism, Newtonianism, and a blend of both. Frederick's own views

---

[27] The Earl of Ilchester and Mrs Langford-Brooke, *The life of Sir Charles Hanbury Williams: Poet, wit and diplomatist* (London, 1929), p. 212.
[28] For more information on Williams's link to Catherine, see Tony Brenton, 'The Ambassador, the Grand Duke, his wife and her lover', *History Today* (2008), pp. 14-19. Williams' diplomatic abilities have generally taken a back seat to his very large range and volume of correspondence, which is widely consulted for his views on various European courts and their personalities. He failed in Prussia and Austria, and had very little success in St. Petersburg. See Mary Margaret Stewart, 'Williams, Charles Hanbury (1708-1759)', *ODNB*, at https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/29488, accessed 5 June 2018.
[29] Earl of Ilchester and Mrs Langford-Brooke, *Charles Hanbury Williams*, pp. 217, 219.
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 379.
[31] Blanning, *The culture of power*, p. 194.
[32] Robert B. Asprey, *Frederick the Great: The magnificent enigma* (New York, 1986), pp. 146, 149.
[33] Mitchell to Holdernesse, 27 May 1756, BL Add MS 58284, f. 26v.
[34] Ronald S. Calinger, 'Frederick the Great and the Berlin Academy of Sciences (1740-1766)', *Annals of Science*, 24 (1968), particularly pp. 241-242 but also the discussion of the neglect of Euler's theoretical mathematics.

on the philosophical direction of the Berlin Academy were influenced by Voltaire up until the latter's attack on Maupertuis in *Diatribe of Doctor Akakia* (1752), which left Voltaire exiled from court.[35] Maupertuis, increasingly unwell, departed Berlin in June 1756, leaving Euler at the helm as acting President and facing a task to promote the utility of science to a sceptical Prussian state.[36] In the early months of 1756, then, Mitchell arrived in Frederick's Berlin in the midst of a struggle for philosophical direction. While there is no doubt that Frederick exercised ultimate authority in the larger direction of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, Mitchell recognised that his personal audiences with Frederick would make best use of his diplomatic skills. The encounters with philosophers in and around the court, particularly in the early years of Mitchell's time in Berlin, were thus secondary. Despite his interests in the learned pursuits of the Academy, Mitchell rightly focused on cultivating his connection with Frederick.

Mitchell noted immediately the frankness with which Frederick discussed with him his plans, his ideas, and his fears.[37] Back home, Holdernesse and George II were also pleased with Mitchell's progress in building a relationship with the Prussian ruler, in which, Holdernesse was sure, Mitchell's 'constant zeal and diligence' would serve him well in both Britain and Prussia.[38] It is important again here to maintain perspective that Frederick was effectively becoming encircled both militarily and diplomatically, and that, from this encirclement, he could be assisted only by Britain, and even then only financially. Thus Mitchell was the man on the spot, so to speak – he embodied Britain, Frederick's only powerful ally. He was certainly in Frederick's confidence, as the monarch speculated with Mitchell about British communications with Russia in May 1756, and what that court's next move may be. Frederick was 'pleased with the accounts which [Holdernesse] enabled me to communicate concerning Russia, yet still I could perceive some doubt and diffidence remained, and I suspect there have been accounts from that Court of a very different nature, tho' no body here chuses to speak out'.[39] The theft in Berlin, and subsequent recovery, of confidential letters sent by Mitchell to London seems to have brought him closer to Frederick, who sympathised with his situation and thought Mitchell's fair explanation of the contents of the letters laudable.[40] When the letters were still missing, Mitchell had met with Frederick to discuss their contents and make plans for what was effectively damage limitation.

---

[35] Ronald S. Calinger, 'The Newtonian-Wolffian Controversy: 1740-1759', *Journal of the History of Ideas,* 30 (1969), pp. 319-330. This probably did little to help Charles Hanbury Williams's cause at court, as he was a close friend of Voltaire and often in his company. See Earl of Ilchester and Mrs Langford-Brooke*, Charles Hanbury Williams*, pp. 201-208.

[36] Ronald S. Calinger, *Leonhard Euler: Mathematical genius in the enlightenment* (Princeton and Oxford, 2016), pp. 407-408.

[37] Mitchell to Holdernesse, 14 May 1756, National Archives Kew, State Papers Prussia (SP) 90/65.

[38] Holdernesse to Mitchell, 28 May 1756, SP 90/65.

[39] Mitchell to Holdernesse, 27 May 1756, BL Add MS 58284, f. 25v.

[40] Mitchell to Holdernesse, 3 June 1756 and 5 June 1756, SP 90/65; Mitchell to Holdernesse, 3 June 1756, BL Add MS 58284, ff. 42r-44r. The diarist Ernst Ahasverus Count von Lehndorff noted on 1 and 2 June 1756 that the theft of Mitchell's letter bag was the most popular conversational topic among the court, after the earthquakes in Portugal. See Karl Eduard Schmidt-Lözen, ed, *Dreißig Jahre am Hofe Friedrichs des Großen: Aus den Tagebüchern des Reichsgrafen Ernst Ahasverus Heinrich von Lehndorff, Kammerherrn der Königin Elisabeth Christine von Preußen* (Gotha, 1907), p. 277.

He detailed these discussions in his dispatches to Holdernesse. On the ongoing affair with the Prince of Hesse-Cassel – the subject of a diplomatic and religious struggle between France and Prussia – Mitchell told Frederick that he had written candidly about Frederick's ill-thoughts on the Prince. Frederick was anxious to deny any damage done by words attributed to him, and Frederick said that 'I will deny that I ever said such things & lay it upon you, I will tell Him that you are an Enthusiast and so zealous a protestant that you can not think with candour of one that has changed his Religion', and Mitchell added 'to this I agreed'.[41] These concerted efforts to manage the diplomatic situation can only have brought the two closer together, and Mitchell mentions on multiple occasions Frederick being 'pleased with my openness', which the King reciprocated.[42] Events moved quickly, and in his last private meeting with Frederick prior to Frederick's departure for Stettin, Mitchell noted the most important points, which were that Frederick believed Kaunitz, in bringing Austria together with France, 'had got an ascendant over the Empress Queen' [his employer]; that the Franco-Austrian alliance was 'unnatural & could not last'; and that as Austria and France were 'stretching every nerve' to 'seduce Russia into their Cabal', Britain must take every reasonable political and financial measure to maintain a Russian alliance. Frederick's thoughts were for Mitchell's ears alone, for when Count Podewils asked Mitchell the substance of their conversation, he did so with 'some curiosity to know what had passed between the King and me … I was shy to answer as I have heard that the King rarely tells his Ministers his Secrets'.[43]

Mitchell, however, had little time to adapt to court life, or to create a dynamic in which to combine intellectual pursuits with diplomatic aims. His pre-war work was purely diplomatic, and frequently he was with Frederick for extended periods of time, including a two day stay at Potsdam in July 1756.[44] By late September 1756, the Prussians had commenced hostilities, and Mitchell was writing of his ambition to shortly follow Frederick into Bohemia,[45] for 'nothing can be done [in Berlin] in his absence'.[46] When the Prussians marched into Saxony on early September, Mitchell was by Frederick's side. Britain's Envoy Extraordinary to Saxony, David Murray, Lord Stormont, came to Frederick and begged him to let the Saxon army escape. Both Frederick and Frederick's physician Johann Georg von Zimmerman record the letter Stormont wrote prior to the meeting, and the meeting itself. Zimmermann claimed that Stormont was motivated by having recently married a Saxon lady. According to Zimmermann, Stormont favoured the Old System (see section above on the Diplomatic Revolution) so much that it blinded him to diplomatic protocol with Frederick. Zimmermann recounts how Frederick told him 'smilingly, how, in Saxony, he became acquainted with his great enemy, Lord Stormont'. When Frederick reached Pirna, Zimmermann

[41] Mitchell to Holdernesse, Most Secret, 3 June 1756, BL Add MS 58284, f. 49.
[42] *Ibid.*
[43] Mitchell to Holdernesse, Secret, 7 June 1756, BL Add MS 58284, the entire letter ff. 61-63. Podewils also laments the mismanagement of Britain's Russian alliance, and wishes that 'Mr Villiers' – Thomas Villiers, formerly British envoy to Prussia – would be sent in Williams' place. Finckenstein also expressed this to Mitchell, as Mitchell reported on 22 June 1756, BL Add MS 58284, f. 96^{v}.
[44] This he reported in Mitchell to Holdernesse, 23 July 1756, BL Add MS 58284, f. 140.
[45] Mitchell to Holdernesse, 28 September 1756, SP 90/66, no folio number.
[46] Mitchell to Holdernesse, 14 October 1756, SP 90/66, no folio number.

writes that, by way of letter, 'Stormont intreated the king to let the whole Saxon army escape'.[47] In the letter itself, sent on 2 September, forwarded by Mitchell to Frederick, and reprinted in Frederick's *Political Correspondence*, Stormont said that he had been invited to a meeting of the Saxon ministers and was asked to mediate under the terms of the Treaty of Dresden signed in 1745. Stormont further argued that he accepted the request in order to carry out the King's orders at his posting.[48] Zimmermann claimed to present at the meeting when Stormont made his 'elegant speech' on 4 September. According to Zimmermann, when 'Frederick did not choose to comply with this demand [of releasing the Saxon army], the Lord went himself to him in his camp, and tried, in an *elegant speech*, to persuade the king, that it was highly his interest, to compound with Austria and Saxony as soon as possible'. Here, two different accounts emerge. It would not have been in Frederick's interests to protest about this to the British ministry when he had just invaded Saxony. As such, he writes Mitchell a fairly benign account of the meeting. Zimmermann's account involves Mitchell being present.

In Frederick's account of the meeting, he acknowledged receiving Stormont's letter on 2 September. Mitchell had forwarded it to him and warned him of Stormont coming to meet him.[49] Frederick then told Mitchell that Stormont did indeed visit him, and that, while he felt Stormont had disobeyed his diplomatic instructions and probably displeased the British ministry, he felt the Saxon ministers had tricked Stormont into confronting him. Frederick concluded that Stormont was 'very agreeable to any one, of a sweet and amiable character, and who promises a great deal'.[50] Frederick's letter is addressed to Mitchell at Berlin, and says that he hoped to give Mitchell news from Bohemia in one week; and Mitchell wrote in October that he was hoping to follow Frederick soon. All this indicates that Mitchell and Frederick were apart until mid-October. Thus, it is with scepticism that we read Zimmermann's account of the meeting:

> This *elegant speech* of an English minister was directly averse to the interest of England. Sir Andrew Mitchell was present. The king, without giving any answer to the orator, contented himself with look at Mitchel, who was not so forbearing as Frederick. He took Stormont to the window, rebuked him severely, threatened, and then returned to the king, to whom he whispered something, the purport of which I know, but keep to myself.[51]

[47] Johann Georg Zimmermann, *Select views of the life, reign and character of Frederick the Great, King of Prussia*, trans. Major Neuman, Vol. 1 (London, 1792), p. 212.
[48] Stormont to Frederick, 2 September 1756, forwarded by Mitchell, in *Pol. Corr.*, Vol. 13, p. 339.
[49] Mitchell to Frederick, 2 September 1756, BL Add MS 58292, f. 21.
[50] Frederick to Mitchell, 4 September 1756, *Pol. Corr.*, Vol. 13, p. 339.
[51] Zimmermann, *Select views*, pp. 213-214.

Zimmermann added after this that he was not present, writing 'all this, and what Mitchel whispered to the king, I learnt from Baron Horst, who had it from Frederick himself'.[52] In a letter of 18 September Mitchell told Stormont that he would assure Frederick of Stormont's respect, and also informed Stormont of Frederick's respect for him. This is the sentiment expressed in Frederick's letter to Mitchell of 4 September, and Mitchell repeats to Stormont Frederick's concerns that the court of Saxony may be using Stormont.[53] Whether it was falsehood or truth on the part of Frederick, he certainly seems to have not felt Stormont to be his 'great enemy' at this time.

By 14 October, Mitchell was in Dresden,[54] and by the 20th, had moved south to Sedelitz. The pace of movement settled from then on, and by November, Mitchell was back in Dresden, Frederick having cantoned his troops around the city for the remainder of the year.[55] In early 1757, Mitchell was dispatched to Hanover on crown business,[56] and from thence, via Brunswick and Dresden to rejoin the Prussian camp at Karwetetz in Bohemia.[57] Thus, Mitchell's immediate concerns were to report accurately and frequently about the impending war and, when it broke out, to report from the various encampments. The pressing of the war effort left no room in his circle, as far as can be ascertained from correspondence, for intellectual or other pursuits. His coordination with other British diplomats, particularly Charles Hanbury Williams in St Petersburg, David Murray (Lord Stormont) in Saxony, and Walter Titley in Denmark, as well as liaising with Finckenstein and Podewils in Prussia, took up Mitchell's time and his focus. It is not until February 1757, about ten months into his posting, that letters appear to show Mitchell expanding his network.

iii. Expanding the emerging network

Friedrich Wilhelm Karl von Schmettau (1742-1806), Prussian general and later surveyor, wrote to Mitchell embracing his friendship,[58] but others wrote on business and gave no sign of their other interests or remarked on their friendship with Mitchell.[59] Patrick Murdoch's presence as Mitchell's secretary until

---

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 214.
[53] Mitchell to Stormont, draft, 18 September 1756, BL Add MS 58292, f. 28.
[54] Mitchell to Holdernesse, 14 October 1756, SP 90/66, no folio number.
[55] Mitchell to Holdernesse, 4 November 1756 and 29 December 1756, SP 90/67.
[56] Mitchell to Holdernesse, 26 February 1757, SP 90/68, no folio number.
[57] Mitchell to Holdernesse, 29 April 1757, SP 90/68, no folio number.
[58] Schmettau to Mitchell, 7 February 1757, BL Add MS 58292, f. 52. Schmettau was disgraced for his capitulation at Dresden in 1759, for which the King wrote 'You ought to be glad you still have your head on your shoulder'. See Franz A. J. Szabo, *The Seven Years War in Europe, 1756-1763* (London and New York, 2008), p. 243; Schmettau's mapping skills are briefly touched upon in Peter Barber, 'Maps and monarchs in Europe 1500-1800', in Oresko, Gibbs and Scott, eds, *Royal and republican sovereignty*, pp. 91, 94.
[59] See, for example, letters from Marc Antoine de la Haye de Launay, Administrator-General of the King's Customs, and Heinrich Schrader von Schliestedt, Finance Minister in Brunswick. BL Add MS 58292, ff. 42r-44v. For more on de la Haye's later career administering finance, see Florian Schui, *Rebellious Prussians: Urban political culture under Frederick the Great and his successors* (Oxford, 2013), p. 90. De la Haye was also known to discourse and debate on philosophy as shown in Dieudonné Thiébault, *Original Anecdotes of Frederick the Great, King of Prussia*, Vol. 1 (Philadelphia, 1806), pp. 364-365.

early 1757 certainly helped establish Mitchell's early acquaintances. Pressed into business immediately upon his arrival in Berlin, Mitchell would have appreciated Murdoch's secretarial work as well as his intellectual pursuits.[60] Murdoch told Andrew Millar, the bookseller and a long time mutual friend of he and Mitchell, that 'I have the geographer sometimes to talk German with me, and make a few visits, particularly at Lieberkühn's', adding that, 'I continue my correspondence with M. de M…'[61]. Friendships like those with Johann Georg Sulzer, the anatomist Christian Gottlieb Lieberkühn, and others, were remembered fondly by Murdoch in letters to Mitchell a number of years later.[62] His partisan position had also given Murdoch a healthy dislike for the conduct of Voltaire. 'What a fine opportunity that fool Voltaire has lost by being a scoundrel!', Murdoch wrote, later asking for more news on his friends in Berlin, including Sulzer and Angelo Cori.[63]

These men represented a cross-section of the friendships formed by Mitchell, Murdoch, and Mitchell's secretary Alexander Burnet. Angelo Cori, an Italian, formerly resided in Britain, working at a theatre in Haymarket during the rich theatrical years of the mid to late 1730s. Cori had been drawn into the world of operatic politics, particularly debate over Walpole's government, the Licensing Act of 1737, and indeed disputes between Spain and Britain which were publicly debated in Britain.[64] The dispute used Spain's retention of the opera singer Farinelli as a tool to beat the Walpole ministry, and mocking articles published in the *Craftsman* portrayed Cori as Robert Walpole's brother Horatio and Cori's Haymarket Theatre as the '*Sanctum Sanctorum* of *Nonsense*'.[65] It is possible that Mitchell was already at least peripherally familiar with Cori, due to his own interest in opera, the theatre, and friendship with men like Thomson. In addition, Cori had possibly been in London since at least 1734, after which time he had done some re-

[60] Murdoch had been along to at least one meeting of the Berlin Academy of Sciences in 1756 and, as Sulzer was also in attendance, possibly made his acquaintance there. See Sitzungsprotokoll der königlich preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin vom 03. Juni 1756, at http://akademieregistres.bbaw.de/exist/apps/SadeRegistres/data/protokolle/0432-1756_06_03.xml, accessed 26 July 2017.

[61] Murdoch to Mitchell, 20 November 1756, BL Add MS 6840, f. 17. The 'M. de M.' is possibly either Monsieur, or Madame, de Maupertuis, a reference to Jean-Louis Moreau de Maupertuis, President of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, or his wife, with the latter of whom Mitchell later carried on a brief correspondence.

[62] Murdoch to Mitchell, in BL Add MS 6840: 24 August 1759, f.38; 28 January 1761, f. 44; and 5 October 1761, f. 48.

[63] For the Voltaire remark, see Murdoch to Mitchell, 5 January 1758, BL Add MS 6840, f. 34. Murdoch also mentioned others, such as 'Gregori' and 'Lorenz'. There is no certain information on them, except what might be conjectured about 'Gregori'. 'Gregori' is possibly Karl Wilhelm Gregory, who later went as Prussian secretary of legation to London in or before 1770. See Frederick II to Karl Wilhelm Gregory, *Political Correspondence of Frederick the Great*, p. 11, at http://friedrich.uni-trier.de/de/politKorr/30/11-o3/?h=Gregory, accessed 24 July 2017. The Marquis d'Argens also mentions a 'the son of Gregory, one of our good merchants in Berlin, among the richest bankers of that city…', see Marquis d'Argens to Frederick II, 2 December 1764, *Oeuvres*, Vol. 19, p. 441, at http://friedrich.uni-trier.de/de/oeuvres/19/441/text/?h=Gregory, accessed 24 July 2017. A 'Gregory' appears at the Berlin Academy of Sciences, in a meeting of 21 June 1759, but no other detail is given. See Protokoll des 21. June 1759, at http://akademieregistres.bbaw.de/exist/apps/SadeRegistres/data/protokolle/0555-1759_06_21.xml, accessed 26 July 2017.

[64] McGeary, *The politics of opera*, pp. 176-177 passim. More on the British and Spanish disputes in context of sentiment in London and Britain is given in Wilson, *The sense of the people*, pp. 140-165.

[65] *Ibid.*

writing of Italian librettos and even had some role in the management of the Royal Academy of Music.[66] At the court of Prussia, he was the Director of the Berlin Opera, and is known to have worked setting Voltaire's *Semiramis* into Italian verses for an opera to be scored by Frederick's sister Wilhelmina, Margravine of Bayreuth.[67] Cori was part of a larger Italian contingent in the conduct of operas in Berlin, which Frederick prioritised over the musical traditions of France. Indeed, Claudia Terne has argued that the orientation of Frederick's opera toward Italian culture had as much to do with cultural preferences as displays of foreign policy and 'dynastic self-understanding'.[68] Cori was still director in 1767, when Frederick wrote to Karl Ludwig von Pöllnitz, his court favourite, that Cori still had not presented him with updates on the latest opera.[69] Mitchell did not record attending the opera, but James Harris, his visiting guest and future successor, recorded attending operas, plays and balls when in Berlin with Mitchell in 1767. Harris also recorded hearing Frederick play the flute before being introduced to him, and this must have also been an experience Mitchell shared.[70] Cori died in 1775 when employed as Director of the Opera, and Inspector of the Costumes, and had attended the Berlin Academy on one occasion.[71] It is the relationship to Sulzer, forged in Berlin and Leipzig, that has brought the most lasting, and under-explored, relationship of Mitchell's Berlin career. It is Mitchell's lasting friendship with Sulzer that is most important for both this thesis, and the history of cultural diplomacy more generally.

As will be explored further in Chapter 6, Mitchell spent the winter quarters of 1760-61 in Leipzig exposing Frederick to the talents of his native scientists and writers.[72] Mitchell, along with the King's companion the Marquis d'Argens, 'praised the works of the spirit among the Germans on all occasions', and here also Sulzer met the King. Sulzer, his friends recorded, 'made use of two friends of prestige and

---

[66] Lowell Lindgren, 'Handel's London – Italian musicians and librettists', in Donald Burrows, ed, *The Cambridge companion to Handel* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 82. Cori also appears in a printed catalogue of works performed in London, the earliest being 8 April 1735. See William J. Burling, *A checklist of new plays and entertainments on the London stage, 1700-1737* (London and Toronto, 1993), p. 171.

[67] Edith E. Cuthell, *Wilhelmina: Margravine of Baireuth*, Vol. 2 (London, 1905), p. 177. Cori is highly praised for his operatic writing in *London Magazine and Monthly Chronologer* (London, 1737), p. 689. Louis Schneider recounts how Lord Carteret played a key role in Cori's appointment. Oddly enough Carteret then scandalously remarked on the beauty of Cori's wife in getting him appointed, while spreading rumour around Europe of Cori's ugliness (despite his musical talents). See Louis Schneider, *Geschichte der Opera und des Königlichen Opernhauses in Berlin* (Berlin, 1852), pp. 98-99.

[68] Claudia Terne, 'Friedrich II. von Preußen und die Hofoper', in Michael Kaiser and Jürgen Luh, eds, *Friedrich der Große und der Hof. Beiträge des zweiten Colloquiums in der Reihe "Friedrich300" vom 10./11. Oktober 2008* (Friedrich300 – Colloquien, 2), at http://www.perspectivia.net/publikationen/friedrich300-colloquien/friedrich-hof/Terne_Hofoper, accessed 2 August 2017.

[69] Frederick II to Karl Ludwig von Pöllnitz, 20 July 1767, *Oeuvres de Frédéric le Grand*, Briefnachweise B4183, supplement 27 at http://friedrich.uni-trier.de/de/briefNachweise/5/id/004183000/text/?h=Cori, accessed 24 July 2017.

[70] The letters of James Harris pertaining to this time date from July-October 1767, and are found in Donald Burrows and Rosemary Dunhill, eds, *Music and theatre in Handel's world: The family papers of James Harris, 1732-1780* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 489-497.

[71] Schneider, *Geschichte der Opera*, pp. 179-180; Protokoll des 05. April 1759, at http://akademieregistres.bbaw.de/exist/apps/SadeRegistres/data/protokolle/0549-1759_04_05.xml, accessed 26 July 2017.

[72] A cache of wines was also made available to Mitchell on campaign, a list of which was sent to him to keep his table from being overly – and embarrassingly – frugal. 131 bottles of wine were dispatched to him in Dresden in April 1757; by August, he still had 118. See BL Add MS 58364, Mitchell Papers and Household Receipts, ff. 17, 18.

service, who were fortunate to be honoured by the king with an excellent confidence'.[73] More explicitly, the existing account of Sulzer's introduction to Frederick gives specific credit for the introduction to Mitchell and d'Argens.

Sulzer had pleased Frederick by coming up with the idea for a medal of bravery for Colonel von der Heyden, who had withstood multiple sieges during the Seven Years' War.[74] Sulzer's friend Johann Jakob Bodmer affirmed to Sulzer that Mitchell was doing all he could for the German intellectuals, which they themselves could not do by their works alone.[75] Sulzer found Mitchell 'a great connoisseur of all things beautiful and good; and as great a philosopher as a statesman, who as a result had acquired a deep knowledge of humanity'. The writers of Sulzer's life added that Mitchell's friendship with Sulzer in Magdeburg 'had been the only time [Sulzer] had had pleasure'.[76] It is possible that the two bonded over the works of James Thomson, which Sulzer had worked to translate some fifteen years earlier.[77] In addition, they worked together on Robert Symmer's theories of the two powers of electricity, with Mitchell as facilitator and Sulzer as reviewer and correspondent.[78] It is in Leipzig that Mitchell also transmitted Symmer's electrical theories to Sulzer, Frederick, and others.[79] The bonds of science that brought Sulzer and Mitchell together will be explored further in Chapter 5.

Much less is known of Mitchell's friendships with men linked to the Berlin Academy of Sciences, such as mathematician Leonhard Euler, and the Academy's perpetual secretary, Jean-Henri Samuel Formey. It is through the long-time Prussian courtier and Queen's Chamberlain Count Ernst Ahasverus von Lehndorff that we learn more about these types of relationships. Lehndorff, an assiduous diarist, took note of the dinners he shared with Mitchell in which he practised his English, and presumably, Mitchell his German.[80] Lehndorff dined occasionally with Mitchell, through whom he met other Englishmen and expanded his own circle of acquaintances.[81] Though he does not appear in Lehndorff's correspondence in relation to Mitchell, Leonhard Euler certainly knew Mitchell soon after his arrival in Berlin. Their friendship has been little remarked upon, but gives some insight into the links Mitchell sought to make in Berlin, and maintain back in Britain.

---

[73] *Hirzel an Gleim über Sulzer den Weltweisen*, Vol. 2 (Zürich and Winterthur, 1779), p. 21.
[74] *Ibid*, pp. 21-22. It is possibly this intervention from Mitchell on Sulzer's behalf that enabled the latter to join the Berlin Academy of Sciences in 1761. See *Hirzel an Gleim*, p. 23.
[75] Gustav Bernhard Volz, *Friedrich der Große im Spiegel seiner Zeit,* Vol. 2, *Siebenjähriger Krieg und Folgezeit bis 1778* (Berlin, 1901), p. 136.
[76] *Ibid.*, pp. 46-47.
[77] J. G. Sulzer to Gleim, Magdeburg, 18 November 1745, in Wilhelm Körte, ed, *Briefe der Schweizer Bodmer, Sulzer, Gessner: Aus Gleim's litterarischem Nachlasse* (Zürich, 1804), p. 28. The bulk of Körte's edition is known to be an editorial mishmash of documents and neglectful editing, however this letter seems entire.
[78] Much of BL Add. MS 6839 concerns Symmer's correspondence with Mitchell, his electrical experiments, and his attempts to bring it to a broader intellectual and popular audience.
[79] Symmer to Mitchell, 27 February 1761, BL Add. MS 6839, f. 213^{v}. Also in the letter of 7 April 1761, BL Add. MS 6839, f. 220^{v}; J. L. Heilbron, 'Robert Symmer and the two electricities', *Isis*, 67 (1976), p. 17.
[80] Diary of Ernst Ahasverus von Lehndorff, 14 July 1756, in Wieland Giebel, ed, *Die Tagebücher des Grafen Lehndorff. Die geheimen Auszeichnungen des Kammerhern der Königin Elisabeth Christine* (Berlin, 2007), p. 315.
[81] Lehndorff, 13-17 September 1756, in *Dreißig Jahre*, p. 303.

On his arrival, Mitchell carried a letter from Johann Caspar Wettstein, chaplain to the Prince of Wales, to the famed mathematician and sometime leader of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, Leonhard Euler. Euler wrote Wettstein that he was pleased with the important and pleasant acquaintance of Mitchell. Mitchell had 'showered me with marks of his affection and well being', Euler wrote, adding that he owed Wettstein a debt for 'this advantageous liaison [Mitchell] for which I have the honour to present my very humble thanks'.[82] It appears that Mitchell was also tasked with delivering to Euler a history of the Royal Society of London, which was coming with the Mitchell's books from London, but the exchange of which had been impeded by business on both their parts.[83] These Mitchell finally obtained for Euler in October 1756, along with maps of North America which assisted Euler in comparing, correcting, and having copies engraved in Berlin.[84] Euler's correspondence with Wettstein touched on Mitchell but also his friend and temporary secretary in Berlin, Patrick Murdoch, during correspondence in March 1757. Evidently Wettstein had commended Euler on his friendship with Mitchell, but Euler saw this as normal between learned men. Regarding Mitchell, Euler told Wettstein that 'to know a minister who has the approval and the confidence of our king is much too precious and too important for me not to have the greatest obligation to you'.[85] Murdoch appears to have taken his chance with Euler also, proposing to the mathematician a development of 'an alternative way of looking at the moon's atmosphere', evidently in light of incorrect assumptions made by Euler and noted by Murdoch, which Euler at length explained to Wettstein.[86] It was a further sign that Mitchell's diplomatic mission was to be one which involved itself in Prussian intellectual life.

All this has served to show that Mitchell established a network of social and intellectual contacts shortly after his arrival in Berlin, and continued to cultivate these up to the period 1760-61, which has been explored here. Mitchell continued to do so, with some interruption, throughout the Seven Years' War and, indeed, until his death in Berlin in 1771. This part of Chapter 4 has thus far explored the sites in which Mitchell could cultivate a network, and some of the men with whom he successfully linked. The next section explores in more detail, and in a more thematic way, the connections forged by Mitchell with the Berlin Academy of Sciences in his early Berlin career, and what effect this had on Prussian intellectual links to Britain. It does this through a prosopographical exploration of intellectual friendships created by Mitchell. Furthermore, it places these individuals in the context of Prussian Enlightenment under Frederick, and

[82] Leonhard Euler to Johann Caspar Wettstein, Berlin, 30 August 1756, in A. P. Juskevic and E. Winter, eds, *Die Berliner und die Petersburger Akademie der Wissenschaften im Briefwechsel Leonhard Eulers,* Teil 3*, Wissenschaftliche und Wissenschaftsorganisatorie Korrespondenzen 1726-1774* (Berlin, 1976), pp. 342-343. An English translation of the French, from which this quote is taken, is available at http://eulerarchive.maa.org/correspondence/correspondents/Wettstein_en.html, accessed 11 October 2016.
[83] *Ibid.*, p. 343. The book is given on p. 344n4 as Thomas Birch, *The history of the Royal Society of London for improving of natural knowledge*…, Vols. 1-4 (London, 1756-1757).
[84] Euler to Wettstein, 9 October 1756, at http://eulerarchive.maa.org/correspondence/letters/OO2794t.pdf, accessed 20 August 2018.
[85] Euler to Wettstein, 26 March 1757, in *Ibid.*, p. 346. An English translation is also available at the given Euler Archive site above.
[86] *Ibid.*

within the Berlin Academy of Sciences. In this way, we can gauge the meaning of Mitchell's involvement and ascertain its impact.

iv. Mitchell and the Berlin Academy of Sciences

The introduction of this chapter asked two key questions: Firstly, how could Mitchell, and why did he, decide to cultivate knowledge networks in a foreign land, with a foreign academy? Secondly, in what ways did this enhance or detract from his ability to conduct British diplomatic affairs in Prussia? The answer to the first question has been partially addressed. By cultivating a close relationship with Frederick, Mitchell positioned himself at the centre of power and knowledge in Prussia. It was clear to all that Frederick took the lead in Mitchell's two key interest areas, being intellectual life and foreign affairs. In some ways, the decision to cultivate knowledge networks, then, was a necessary part of his job. By cultivating Frederick's friendship, Mitchell was performing his diplomat's duty and fulfilling the requirements of his brief. The decision, however, to liaise and cultivate friendships with members of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, was one which reinforced the alternative view Mitchell took of diplomacy. The cultural transfer that Mitchell effected between Prussia and Britain was made possible in this way.[87] While Charles Hanbury Williams favoured a personal diplomacy with men the learned men of Berlin – Voltaire, Julien Offray de La Mettrie, the Marquis d'Argens, Francesco Algarotti – and also had the background of having been a member of the Royal Society, there are nonetheless discernable differences in he and Mitchell's conduct, which places a spotlight on the different methods employed by Mitchell for success. One might also contrast this, to the other extreme, with William Hamilton, British Envoy Extraordinary to Naples, who carried out scientific investigations of Mount Vesuvius, was a vital British focal point in Naples and took part in its cultural life, but who had little influence with its ruler.[88] The answer to the question of why Mitchell engaged with the Berlin Academy can be supplied by examining the growth of Mitchell's personal relationship with Frederick, and his friendships with those in and out of favour with Frederick. Here, this will be conducted through a study of the individuals surrounding the Berlin Academy of Sciences, a focal point for learning and intellectual life but also an instrument of state power, control, and bureaucracy in Frederick's Prussia.

William Dilthey writes that, from the beginning of his reign, the Berlin Academy of Sciences was 'a powerful, independent ingredient of Frederick's cultural policy'.[89] This sentence might seem like a contradiction in terms. The Academy could not have been an independent part in a system entirely

[87] Katrin Kohl, 'Die Berliner Akademie als Medium des Kulturtransfers im Kontext der europäischen Aufklärung', in Kaiser and Luh, eds, *Friedrich der Große*, at http://www.perspectivia.net/publikationen/friedrich300-colloquien/friedrich-kulturtransfer/kohl_akademie, accessed 2 August 2017.
[88] See, for example, Christa Jungnickel and Russell McCormmach, *Cavendish: The experimental life* (Lewisburg, 1999), pp. 163-164.
[89] William Dilthey, 'Frederick and the Academy', in Peter Paret, ed, *Frederick the Great: A profile* (London and Basingstoke, 1972), p. 178.

dependent on Frederick's will. Certainly he meddled little in the day-to-day running of the Academy during the Seven Years' War, but his influence was never far away. Dilthey clarifies that the intellectual characteristics of Berlin owed their renovation 'to the time when Frederick and his Frenchmen set the tone of society'.[90] The French focus in the leadership of the academy showed Frederick's intention to broaden the reach of his Academy, but also to effect a strong statement about his cultural preferences.[91] The French influence on the leadership of the Academy was very strong, and intertwined with it was Frederick's pragmatic view of its role in assisting the state.[92] But it should also be noted that the French leadership was a statement about Frederick's perceptions on the lesser capabilities of native intellectuals to set the tone of the Academy. The Academy, then, 'was clearly an intrinsic component of enlightened monarchical display', according to Theodor Schieder.[93] The Academy supported Frederick in giving the king's ambitions more credibility, and the King supported the Academy by imbuing it with a status befitting his absolute rule.[94]

Frederick's ambitions for the direction of the Berlin Academy were underscored by these three points: the French leadership that would give it European credibility; the public endorsement of philosophers and poets in his own type of power display; and thereby, the intertwining of European politics with intellectual life. Bringing together the first two of those three points in the directorship of the Academy had been a cause of great interest for Frederick. In appointing Maupertuis, he had accepted Voltaire's recommendation. However, when Voltaire eventually fell out with Frederick, which Tim Blanning attributes both to Voltaire's jealousy over the success of Maupertuis, and the matter of pride which Voltaire's attacks on the leader of Frederick's Academy had stirred up, Frederick intervened to save his own face and that of the Academy.[95] The two, for Frederick, were one and the same. Maupertuis led the Academy until his death in 1759, after which it was nominally led by Leonhard Euler. Frederick allowed the leadership to rest during the Seven Years War, but at its conclusion, he himself nominally led the Society[96] (though did not attend) before approaching the French *Encyclopediste* Jean le Rond d'Alembert to lead it.[97]

D'Alembert visited Frederick and stayed at Sans Souci, but he was reluctant to commit himself to Frederick for a number of reasons. The saga of Voltaire, whom d'Alembert still held dear, was one; the warnings of others that Prussia lacked the intellectual stimulation of Paris were probably partly true at that point; and through all this, the temper of Frederick during his courtship of Frederick frequently veered

[90] *Ibid*., p. 191.
[91] Kohl, 'Die Berliner Akademie'.
[92] Mary Terrall, 'The culture of science in Frederick the Great's Berlin', *History of Science*, 28 (1990), pp. 333-334, 338; Calinger, 'Frederick the Great', p. 239.
[93] Theodor Schieder, *Frederick the Great*, ed. and trans. Sabina Berkeley and H. M. Scott (London and New York, 2000), p. 43.
[94] Terrall, 'Culture of science', p. 336.
[95] Blanning, *Frederick the Great*, pp. 332-334.
[96] Calinger, *Leonhard Euler*, p. 408.
[97] Dilthey, 'Frederick and the Academy', p. 195; Schieder, *Frederick the Great*, p. 42.

between pleading and obstinate.[98] Luise Mühlbach put into Frederick's mouth an historical fiction, in which he damned d'Alembert for his refusal to become the President of the Academy, and lamented that history would judge the Frenchman a fool.[99] In reality, the saga played out slowly and, to Andrew Mitchell, rather worryingly. This was in part because of the undue influence which Mitchell felt that the French intellectuals held in Frederick's mind. While Mitchell did not fear that Frederick would return to an alliance with France, he nevertheless seems to have been anxious about Frederick's continuing cultural flirtations with France.

Frederick's esteem for d'Alembert was high enough that he ranked the author of the Introduction to the *Encyclopedie* as superior to a General or a conqueror of whole countries.[100] Yet it is difficult to be clear about Frederick's intentions regarding d'Alembert. Voltaire, famously caustic and often mocking, wrote that in beating the French at Rossbach in 1757, Frederick 'has obtained what he always wished: to beat the French, to be admired by them, to mock them'.[101] According to Voltaire, Frederick's mixed intentions had so befuddled Maupertuis that he told d'Alembert, 'I don't advise you ever to go and fill his place at Berlin; you would repent that'.[102] In doing so, Voltaire compared himself to Ludovico Ariosto's creation Astolfo, warning the gallant Ruggerio (d'Alembert) against falling for the sorceress Alcina (Frederick) and becoming enchanted and imprisoned on her magic island as they did in Ariosto's *Orlando furioso* and Handel's *Alcina.*[103] When d'Alembert did visit Frederick in 1763, the political implications of intellectual friendship and the importance of the Berlin Academy became clearer to Mitchell. He reported that the members of the Berlin Academy were alarmed at the prospect of d'Alembert meeting with Frederick. In addition to concern for the Academy, members of Frederick's court saw it as an attempt by the French to win back Frederick's allegiance, or as a form of cultural diplomacy with a political goal. Mitchell wrote to the Earl of Halifax:

> Others who mix Politicks with every thing think the intended visit of Monsieur D'Alembert to the King of Prussia to be a scheme of the French Ministry to gain that Monarch into their party.[104]

[98] Dilthey, 'Frederick and the Academy', p. pp. 194-195; Franz Kugler, *The Pictorial History of Germany During the Reign of Frederick the Great* (London, 1845), p. 278
[99] Luise Mühlbach, *Frederick the Great and his family: An historical novel*, trans. Mrs. Chapman Coleman and her daughters (New York, 1895), p. 547.
[100] Thomas Campbell, ed, *Frederick the Great, his court and times*, Vol. 4 (London, 1843), p. 311.
[101] Carlyle, *History of Friedrich II*, Vol. 6 (Boston, 1884), p. 395.
[102] *Ibid.*, p. 396.
[103] Charles Osborne, *The opera lover's companion* (New Haven and London, 2007), p. 172. A thorough analysis of this is also provided in Massimo Verdicchio, 'Concerning Ariosto's Modernity: Alcina's Case', in Jonathan Hart, ed, *Imagining culture: Essays in early modern history and literature* (New York and London, 1996), pp. 151-164, particularly pp. 153-155.
[104] Mitchell to the Earl of Halifax, 3 May 1763, in Ronald Grimsley, 'D'Alembert at Potsdam (1763): An English comment', *in Revue de Littérature Comparée*, 35 (1961), pp. 114-115.

With the war then at an end and British relations with Frederick souring, Mitchell's proximity to Frederick led him to believe that Frederick was lost to the French. But Mitchell believed that true diplomacy would have occurred via secret channels, and that the chief cause of Frederick's invitation, and the fuss he made over it, was attributable to his vanity.[105] Frederick had, after all, achieved the coup of luring d'Alembert to Potsdam, as d'Alembert had recently declined an extremely lucrative offer of employment in Russia, tutoring the son of Empress Catherine II.[106] The British ambassador at St. Petersburg, the Earl of Buckinghamshire, was able to confirm this letter to Mitchell some months later.[107] D'Alembert's rejection of the offer of the presidency of the Academy stung Frederick. He had tried several indirect and direct offers to d'Alembert, who in the end held a mutual friendship with Frederick to be the greatest commitment he could make.[108] Though he continued to seek d'Alembert's guidance on appointments and administration of the Academy, Frederick seems to have held some bitterness over the rejection of his overtures. When grammarian Dieudonné Thiébault ventured to Berlin on the recommendation of d'Alembert, Frederick bid him read a 'tolerably spirited and severe epigram' he had written on d'Alembert. Thiébault recounts how Frederick remembered that Thiébault was friendly with d'Alembert, and threatened to cut Thiébault's ears off if he told d'Alembert of the verses.[109] The directorship was still not settled when Mitchell left Berlin for London in 1764. The following year, he wrote to his Berlin friends, enquiring into the entanglements of Voltaire, d'Alembert, Frederick, and the Academy. After mentioning his friends, the academicians Johann Friedrich Meckel and Georg Ludwig von Edelsheim,[110] Mitchell asked whether 'Voltaire [has] got permission to go to Berlin, will Helvetius and d'Alembert quit Paris to play the fool at Potsdam'.[111] Interest in the potential appointment of d'Alembert as President of the Berlin Academy was widespread, not least in England, where Jean Deschamps wrote to the Academy's secretary, Samuel Formey, deriding the links between a 'bel-esprit' like d'Alembert, and an institution of the 'old learned world' like the Berlin Academy.

> Will you then be having, as a new Despot, in your Academy [of Berlin], the Bel-Esprit à la mode, Mr. *Dalambert*? … A *President* who is a Bel-Esprit, in a *Germanic Academy*, what a risible Contrast! But the taste of the century formed by *Voltaire* has absolutely turned toward *Concetti,*

---

[105] *Ibid.*
[106] Mitchell to the Earl of Buckinghamshire, 30 August 1763, in *Ibid.*, p. 115.
[107] Earl of Buckinghamshire to Mitchell, 13 September 1763, BL Add. MS 6826, ff. 35-36.
[108] Ronald Grimsley, *Jean d'Alembert (1717-1783)* (Oxford, 1963), pp. 157-172.
[109] Thiébault, *Original Anecdotes*, Vol. 1, p. 55.
[110] Meckel was an anatomist and Professor of Botany and Surgery in Berlin. See Nikolaus Rüdinger, 'Meckel of Hemsbach, Johann Friedrich', in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* (ADB), 21 (1885), pp. 159-162, at https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz59698.html#adbcontent, accessed 31 July 2017. Edelsheim was one-time Prussian envoy to Vienna and visitor to Britain. See K. Obser, 'Edelsheim, Georg Ludwig Freiherr von', in *ADB* 48 (1904), pp. 261-262, at www.deutsche-biographie.de/gnd116355085.html#adbcontent, accessed 31 July 2017. Brief mention of him is made in Eduard Vehse, *Geschichte der Hofe der Haüser Baiern, Würtemberg, Baden und Hessen*, Part 3 (Hamburg, 1853), p. 226.
[111] Mitchell to unknown, 8 March 1765, Bundle 82, Burnett of Kemnay Papers. This letter is sent *via* Burnet but he is referred to in third person, making this probably a letter to another person but held by Burnet.

> *buffooneries,* and *impieties*. Happily *England* is still sticking to good sense and Reason, and hisses at these frivolities.[112]

Mitchell's interest in the presidential appointment was clear and though he had expressed a disdain for d'Alembert's 'conceit' and 'contempt for the rest of Mankind', the interest he showed in the appointment echoes those earlier diplomatic concerns.[113]

Clearly the Academy was a locus for powerful and influential intellectuals, who worked largely in accordance with the direction that Frederick, and by extension his hand-chosen 'perpetual president' Maupertuis, had wanted it to take. In many ways also, the ability of Prussia alone to provide a vibrant intellectual atmosphere was limited. Johan van der Zande has shown the many places and wellsprings of knowledge that represented a vastly expanded participation in *Aufklärung* in Prussia after 1760. However, van der Zande's claim that Frederick the Great had little or no role in the promotion of Enlightenment ought to be contested. 'Enlightened absolutism had nothing to do with … the constitution of Enlightenment sociability', argues van der Zande.[114] Van der Zande, however, does not dispute that Frederick played a large and guiding role in the Academy, often literally by vetoing elections, and that the Academy itself was a major outlet for the practice of Enlightenment sociability. Other authors, as noted above, have also shown the value Frederick placed on the central figures of the French Enlightenment, and the way in which the leadership hierarchy, the membership, and the printing of the Berlin Academy's papers, was all done in French form. One author has recently pointed out that Frederick saw in his own German people the right ingredients for a strong scientific output, even if he derided their literary capabilities.[115] Whether it was French, British, or any other culture that led the Academy is not the most important factor; what is most important is that Frederick led its evolution and held consistent control of its direction, and by extension, the direction of the outpouring of Enlightenment values through the Academy. As Moses Mendelssohn argued, Enlightenment was and always should be associated with culture; in this way, man could thrive in the best conditions.[116] Mitchell embraced the sociability that the Enlightenment provided, and which enabled his diplomatic efforts. Frederick played the leading role in shaping the outlook of the Berlin Academy of Sciences. This much Mitchell successfully recognised, though his correspondence is lacking any of his personal views on the running of the Academy.

---

[112] Jean Deschamps to Formey, 6 August 1763, cf. Goldgar, *Impolite learning*, p. 231.
[113] Grimsley, 'D'Alembert at Potsdam', p. 114.
[114] Johan van der Zande, 'Prussia and the enlightenment' in Philip G. Dwyer, ed, *The rise of Prussia 1700-1830* (Harlow, 2000), pp. 89-107. For this point see p. 92.
[115] Iwan-Michelangelo d'Aprile, 'Friedrich und die Netzwerke der Wissenschaften', in Kaiser and Luh, eds, *Friedrich der Große*, at http://www.perspectivia.net/publikationen/friedrich300-colloquien/friedrich-kulturtransfer/daprile_netzwerke, accessed 2 August 2017.
[116] Moses Mendelssohn, 'On the Question: What is Enlightenment?', originally published in Berlinische Monatsschrift, 4 (1784), pp. 193-200. Translated and published in James Schmidt, ed, *What is enlightenment? Eighteenth-century answers and twentieth-century questions* (Berkeley and London, 1996), pp. 53-57.

Mitchell, as noted above, probably had his first interaction with a member of Berlin's intellectual elite when he became acquainted with Leonhard Euler in Berlin. He could probably not have known the wrangling in which Euler had been engaged for some fifteen years, in battling the various philosophical divisions within the Academy of Sciences. The revitalisation of the Academy under Frederick in the early 1740s also produced an institutional crisis. Frederick wavered over his vision for the institution: he was a supporter of Christian Wolff, but had also invited Voltaire to lead the Academy. Frederick believed that followers of Leibniz could work hand in hand, in the spirit of philosophical debate, alongside their Newtonian counterparts. Wolff was a disciple of Leibniz, thus at his root he was a believer in the system of 'preestablished harmony' that was fundamentally opposed to the matter theory put forward by Newton.[117] The opposition were best represented by Maupertuis and Euler, the former of whom had taken the post of Director of the Academy at the suggestion of Voltaire.[118] Together, Maupertuis and Euler gave Newtonianism a victory over the followers of Leibniz and Wolff, in part because Wolff declined to participate in the Academy, but also because, in spite of themselves, Maupertuis and Euler had differing ideological bents, neither of which conformed to Wolffianism. Maupertuis was brought in to represent the French Enlightenment and Newtonianism, and while he shared the latter with Euler, Euler was a staunch opponent of the French leadership in the Academy and cultivated his own circle of German scholars.[119] Indeed, Euler was antagonistic to everything but his own devotion to metaphysical theories, which also set him in opposition, at least theoretically, to Newton.[120] While his friend Daniel Bernoulli urged him not to get into metaphysical battles and urged him to adhere to his mathematical strengths, one author has posited that Euler was a 'moderate enlightener', caught between duelling ideologies.[121]

Mitchell's proximity to Frederick, while a requirement of his posting, also enabled intellectual interests. It allowed him to form friendships with those men toward whom Frederick himself gravitated, men like Henri de Catt, the Marquis d'Argens, and Dieudonné Thiébault. Catt, the King's librarian and reader, met Frederick when the King was on a clandestine visit to the Dutch Republic, and later was invited to come to Prussia to fill the position of librarian and reader in 1758.[122] Mitchell became immediately acquainted with Catt when the latter joined Frederick on campaign upon his arrival. In 1760, Catt was elected as an external member to the Berlin Academy of Sciences, and in 1763, upon the request another of the King's favourites, d'Argens, was made a member of the class of Belles Lettres at the Academy.[123] G.

---

[117] William Clark, 'The death of metaphysics in enlightened Prussia', in William Clark, Jan Golinski, and Simon Schaffer, eds, *The sciences in enlightened Europe* (Chicago and London, 1999), pp. 428-429.
[118] Blanning, *Frederick the Great*, p. 333.
[119] Calinger, 'The Newtonian-Wolffian controversy', p. 323. This entire article charts the collision of systems and politics magnificently.
[120] Clark, 'Death of metaphysics', pp. 443-444.
[121] Emil A. Fellmann, *Leonhard Euler,* trans. Erika Gautschi and Walter Gautschi (Basel, Boston and Berlin, 2007), pp. 75, 77.
[122] *Gespräche Friedrichs des Großen mit Henri de Catt* (Leipzig, 1885), the story of their meeting related on pp. 1-4.
[123] For Catt's confirmed election, see 'Sitzungsprotokoll der königlich preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin vom 7 Februar 1760'; for entry to the class of Belles Lettres, see 14. Juli 1763, both available at http://akademieregistres.bbaw.de/exist/apps/SadeRegistres/modules/scripts/protokolle.xql, accessed 26 July 2017.

P. Gooch has contended that Catt was never close to Frederick, nor even reckoned as a friend.[124] Whatever the truth, there is no doubt that Catt's proximity to Frederick afforded him wide access to the King's inner circle, his thoughts, and his emotions. On occasions Frederick visibly broke down before Catt, recounting traumatic dreams of his father, and reactions to battle, all with tears visibly flooding his eyes.[125]

Henri de Catt took an immediate liking to Mitchell, and Catt's memoirs written religiously throughout the early stages of the Seven Years' War show Mitchell's commitment to Frederick, and also his awareness of the King's flaws and vanities. Catt's arrival at the Prussian camp at Breslau on 21 March 1758 was attended by Mitchell, who gave Catt special marks of interest, informed Catt with whom he should and should not speak, and struck Catt with his frank conversation. Everything Mitchell told him, Catt wrote, conformed to the truth. Mitchell told Catt how to listen to the King, how to criticise and when to refrain, and the subjects that he most enjoyed discoursing on: literature, philosophy, metaphysics, and French poets.[126] Frederick clearly explained to Catt his gratitude to Mitchell for all he had done for Anglo-Prussian relations to date, but more so for the faithful servant to the general cause that Mitchell had been. 'He is an excellent man', Frederick told Catt as Mitchell rode past his window. 'This man; of all the English I have seen so far, it is he who interested me most'. Further, Frederick credited Mitchell's interest in literature and history, and his honest heart, for the effect the diplomat had had on him.[127] Mitchell's loyalty and virtue was something of which Frederick was cognisant, referring to these traits in both his 'Épitre a Monsieur Mitchell, sur l'origine du mal' of 1761, and in personal letters to Mitchell into 1762.[128] Frederick expressed his gratitude to both Mitchell and Keith in a letter of 17 February 1762. He asked Mitchell to tell Keith of his sense of gratitude for Keith's work at the Russian court in reaching 'the object of my desires', referring to Frederick's desire for peace with Russia.[129] Of Mitchell, he wrote:

> As for you, Sir, I cannot express enough, how much I am sensitive to all the marks of affection and eternal and grateful attachment, and I will certainly not neglect the opportunity to express to you the perfect esteem I have for you. On this I pray to God that he will have you in his holy and worthy guard.[130]

---

[124] G. P. Gooch, *Frederick the Great: The ruler, the writer, the man* (London, New York and Toronto, 1947), p. 131.
[125] Blanning, *Frederick the Great*, pp. xxi, xxiv, 234.
[126] Henri de Catt, 'Memoiren von Heinrich de Catt zur Geschichte des Siebenjährigen Krieges (1758-1760),' in Reinhold Koser, ed, *Unterhaltungen mit Friedrich dem Großen: Memoiren und Tagebücher von Heinrich de Catt* (Leipzig, 1884), pp. 8-9.
[127] *Ibid.*, pp. 58-59. The original French of the Frederick quotation: C'est un excellent homme que cet homme-là; de tous les Anglais que j'ai vus jusqu' ici, c'est lui qui m'a intéressé le plus.
[128] In the epistle Frederick noted Mitchell as a 'virtuous minister' of a people whose laws restrain their kings from absolutism. See 'Épitre a Monsieur Mitchell, sur l'origine du mal' in *Oeuvres*, Vol. 12, p. 224; for the referral to Mitchell's dedication, of which Frederick was so sensible, see Frederick II to Mitchell, 17 February 1762, in Bisset, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, pp. 262-263.
[129] Frederick to Mitchell, 17 February 1762, in Bisset, *Memoirs*, vol. 2, p. 262,
[130] *Ibid.*, p. 263.

In the context of the letter it is clear that Frederick is hopeful that Mitchell, and Keith in St. Petersburg, will affect the change of diplomatic circumstances vis à vis the end of Russian aggression towards Prussia now that Peter had ascended the Russian throne. This is clear because in the postscript to the above quoted letter Frederick noted Peter's seeming commitment to the Prussian cause, which the English could not match.[131]

On 20 May 1762, Frederick praised Mitchell's goodness and honourable sentiments, writing, 'I could wish that everybody thought in the same manner; the world would be all the happier for it, and men more virtuous'.[132] Catt had helped Frederick revise and edit the epistle to Mitchell between January and March 1759, and was aware that Frederick later also wrote a philosophical epistle on the systems of philosophers, 'which he addressed to M. Mitchell'.[133] In 1767, Catt finally passed on the final draft of Frederick's original 'epitre', with the King's compliments and those of himself, expressing his admiration of Mitchell as a man of true language and heart.[134]

Catt related other such moments of wit and insight.[135] At table with the King in Breslau following the campaign of 1757, Frederick's generals hailed the King with comparisons to Alexander the Great, while Mitchell sat silent. Catt recounts that, boldly, Mitchell posited that the best eulogy of a prince could be that which contained but a few lines. 'Mitchell, you are right', Catt reports was Frederick's response, there was 'nothing more sensible and true' than Mitchell's observation, which Frederick held to be 'judicious'. Frederick praised the observation, but also the fortitude of a subject to tell it to a King.[136] Still, Catt reported that Frederick felt Mitchell needed a little more of the sociability and graces that Chesterfield had extolled – the 'liant' nature – and about which Mitchell had spoken to Frederick.[137] Mitchell, who had read (and later possessed) a number of Chesterfield's (later) famed letters to his son, had told Frederick of their contents, and Frederick felt that Mitchell could do with a little of the polish Chesterfield so recommended

---

131 *Ibid.* A translation and some context is offered in Joseph Towers, *Memoirs of the life and reign of Frederick the Third, King of Prussia*, Vol. 2 (London, 1787), p. 313.
132 Bisset, *Memoirs*, Vol. 1, p. 160.
133 For the earlier mention of the epistle to Mitchell, see Catt, 'Memoiren', pp. 220, 224; for the later epistle of which this author can find no record, see Catt, 'Tagebücher von Heinrich de Catt aus den Jahren 1758-1760' in Koser, ed, *Unterhaltungen*, p. 450.
134 Catt to Mitchell, 28 November 1767, BL Add. MS 6858, f. 99.
135 One of Frederick's earliest appraisals of Mitchell was as a 'very good' man of 'wit'. See Frederick to Prince William his brother, 12 May 1756, quoted in *Oeuvres*, Vol. 25, p. xviii.
136 Catt, 'Memoiren', p. 11.
137 *Ibid.*, pp. 58-59. Chesterfield referred to the 'liant' nature of a gentlemen – a sort of gentile sociability – at least twice. On 18 January 1750 (O.S.), Chesterfield wrote that a man with grace, politeness, and accomplishments possessed that 'liant' nature which made him both prepossessing and easily the superior of a man who had great intelligence but no grace. Later, he wrote that 'banter' about one's abilities and control has 'something engaging and liant in it, and begets that decent familiarity, which it is both agreeable and useful to establish in good houses, and with people of fashion.' For the former, see *The Works of Lord Chesterfield including his Letters to his son etc. to which is prefixed an original life of the author* (New York, 1853), p. 321; for the latter see the same work, 21 January 1751 (O.S.), p. 379.

continually to his son, 'who, of all beings I have seen, had least of what his dear papa desired'.[138] Catt proved an important ally for Mitchell, though Mitchell did not rely on his friendship for access to Frederick. Catt may have kept Mitchell abreast of developments at the Berlin Academy, and certainly acted as Frederick's correspondent with the Academy throughout the war and, from 1766, attended regularly in person.[139] Mitchell later told his secretary Alexander Burnet that Catt was 'the silliest, vainest, emptiest fellow I ever was acquainted with'.[140] Yet his conversations and letters with Catt might in this way be interpreted as politically advantageous.

The Berlin Academy continued to be a common reference point among the men on campaign and in camp with Frederick, and indeed after the war was over. As this thesis has noted above, associations between Mitchell and members of the Berlin Academy, while they occurred in a sociable and intellectual guise, were nevertheless also inseparable from the politics of the Academy – politics which Mitchell could use to his advantage in navigating the changing nature of Frederick's court and his political attitudes. The Marquis d'Argens, Frederick's chamberlain and long-time friend, was one of Frederick's links to the Berlin Academy. Involved heavily in the early days of Frederick's reign when the Academy was reformed, d'Argens was made Director of the Belles Lettres section. D'Argens helped to shape the philosophical interests of the Academy as well as those of Frederick, for example by introducing him to the Abbé de Prades, a controversial Frenchman whose atheistic dissertation led to his expulsion from the Sorbonne, and France. Prades' ignorance of authors deemed most important by d'Argens, such as Charles Rollin, made d'Argens rue bringing him to Berlin.[141] The addition of Voltaire to Frederick's court merely made matters worse for d'Argens, but by the time Mitchell arrived, Prades had departed and Voltaire was gone, with Frederick even refusing to correspond with Voltaire unless it were through d'Argens. Mitchell, though he tolerated d'Argens, does not seem to have though much of his discretion – a mortifying thought for Mitchell considering that d'Argens led or had a hand in Frederick's secret service.[142] He believed d'Argens flaunted his friendship with Frederick for political and social gain. Mitchell wrote, 'the Marquis, who is an honest but a weak man, shews [sic] these letters to all his friends, so that in twenty-four hours after they are received, there are many copies of them circulating in Berlin', adding that he would not be shocked to see

---

[138] *Frederick the Great: The memoirs of his reader Henri de Catt (1758-1760)*, trans. F. S. Flint, Vol. 1 (Boston and New York, 1917), p. 105.

[139] Catt's correspondences and attendances are laid out under his entry at the Digital Registers of the Academy, at http://akademieregistres.bbaw.de/exist/apps/SadeRegistres/modules/scripts/personen.xql?l=C, accessed 26 July 2017.

[140] Mitchell to Burnet, 15 February 1765, Bundle 82, Burnett of Kemnay Papers. This is in relation to Catt's attempt to set his cousin up in London, and impose on Mitchell for a lump sum payment to the young man. Mitchell told Burnet that he had no intention of replying to Catt on that head, and also enclosed to Burnet Catt's letter. See Catt to Mitchell, 28 October 1764, Bundle 82, Burnett of Kemnay Papers. Marlies K. Danziger also notes this in her account of James Boswell's travels in Germany. See Danziger, ed, *James Boswell: The journal of his Swiss and German travels*, p. 25n7.

[141] Julia Gasper, *The Marquis d'Argens: A philosophical life* (Lanham, 2014), p. 186. Some recounting of Frederick's changing opinions on Prades can be found in Giles MacDonogh, *Frederick the Great: A life in deed and letters* (London, 1999), p. 250. According to a contemporary, Charles Rollin was 'an Author whose Works the whole World esteems'. See Goldgar, *Impolite learning*, p. 225.

[142] MacDonogh, *Frederick the Great*, p. 289.

them printed in Amsterdam.[143] In 1761, d'Argens and Mitchell worked together to introduce several German poets and writers to Frederick in Leipzig; they tried to open his eyes not only to the talent in his own land, but also, more objectively, they tried to overcome some of the Prussian antagonism toward the favouring of French mores in Berlin through the promotion of native authors. When d'Argens offered to introduce Gottlieb Wilhelm Rabener to Frederick, Rabener declined to have the honour done by a Frenchman; Mitchell would have preferred that d'Argens had no correspondence with Frederick.[144] Mitchell and d'Argens seemed to believe that a dialogue and dynamic based on intellect alone should be advanced, though they both of course still had their favourites.

D'Argens exercised some political influence with Frederick, who often initiated the conversations about the state of the war and the legacy he might leave if he were killed on the battlefield. The correspondence was conducted from a distance: d'Argens disliked the battlefield camps, thus, unlike Mitchell, his letters were what maintained his friendship with Frederick in the war years. Following defeat at Kunersdorf in 1759, Frederick confided to one person that he no longer felt 'master of his people'. To d'Argens, he wrote that if he had more than one life to give, he would sacrifice it again and again for his country. When d'Argens reassured him that even Louis XIV had suffered worse reverses and still recovered – and indeed flourished in posterity – Frederick was somewhat consoled: he said he thought only of the state.[145] Religion was another area in which d'Argens was employed. Frederick associated himself, perhaps opportunistically, with the Protestant cause and d'Argens was careful to play up the Protestant tendencies of the monarch if they worked for a political and military victory.[146] Frederick had a religious cache in Britain to draw upon, where he was seen as somewhat of a 'Protestant Hero'.[147] Prior to the battle of Kunersdorf, d'Argens proposed that the Archibishop of Canterbury issue a ceremonial sword supporting Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick; and pleaded with Frederick not to speak so harshly of the church or its teachings. Formey was also employed to issue an apology for the King, entitled *L'Anti-Sans-Souci, ou la folie des Nouveaux philosophes*.[148]

In some ways, the long career of Jean-Henri Samuel Formey is also informative about the dynamic of Frederick's relationship to the Berlin Academy, and to Mitchell. Formey was not only perpetual secretary of the Academy, he was also head of its philosophical section. He played a leading role in the advocacy of the values of Christian Wolff within and outside the Academy, and as a Berlin-born Huguenot, also utilised his knowledge of French (and English) to encourage philosophical exchange and keep the Academy abreast

[143] Mitchell to Bute, 23 February 1762, in Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, pp. 260-261.
[144] Gasper, *Marquis d'Argens*. For the Rabener episode, see p. 227; for Mitchell's view on d'Argens' relationship with Frederick, see p. 225.
[145] MacDonogh, *Frederick the Great*, pp. 287-288.
[146] *Ibid.*, p. 251.
[147] Scott, *British foreign policy in the age of the American Revolution*, pp. 33, 46.
[148] MacDonogh, *Frederick the Great*, p. 251. For the story of the sword, see p. 284; on d'Argens and Formey regarding the church and *L'Anti-Sans-Souci*, see p. 293.

of new developments.[149] Alexander Schmidt has noted that Formey was pivotal to the 'public relations and ideology' of the Academy.[150] Margarete G. Smith argued for Formey to be considered an 'assiduous journalist and discreet propagandist', who politely directed many of the Academy's philosophical investigations and embodied the tolerance inherent in the formation of the philosophical section of the Academy.[151] Moreover, Smith has gone to lengths to show Formey as an enlightened man, amazed by the *Encyclopedie* and eager to help expand its scope, while maintaining a moderate approach to Enlightenment and reform.[152] Formey dined with Mitchell and Boswell in Berlin in 1764, where the topics of conversation were books, authors, and travel. 'He was facetious but vain', Boswell wrote, adding that '[Formey] talked of his books, & he talked of his lectures…' Boswell gave nothing away about Mitchell's thoughts on Formey. It is possible that they disagreed over Montesquieu's work, with Mitchell on the side of Montesquieu and Formey pursuing his critique of *L'Esprit des lois*.[153] Boswell recorded that 'after [Formey] was gone, Mr. Mitchell and I talked on the difference of sentiment among mankind, and of the infinite number of books which deluge the field of literature'.[154] We cannot know whether this was a comment on Formey or his work. That Formey came to dinner must be interpreted as a sign of his friendship with Mitchell. Despite the cutting of the Prussian subsidy by Britain, it still seems that Mitchell's friendship with Formey must have covered both intellectual and political developments in Berlin.

While the precise political and social formation of Mitchell's friendship with Formey is unclear, some elements have been deduced from their association. That Mitchell was happiest socialising with cosmopolitan intellects is clear; that he was happy among the French-speaking coterie that surrounded Frederick is less clear, as are his motivations. Frederick's French grammarian, Dieudonné Thiébault, was appointed on the recommendation of d'Alembert, who refused to come to Berlin to head Frederick's Academy. Frederick urged Thiébault to forget about learning German, and to observe his purpose of editing Frederick's French writings.[155] Thiébault did not arrive in Prussia until 1765, two years or more after d'Alembert had initially been offered the presidency of the Berlin Academy. Thiébault's recollections of Mitchell in his *Original Anecdotes of Frederick the Great* are those of a man observing Mitchell and Frederick at court, engaged in witty repartee but also in a post-war Frederician court much changed in mood from previous years. Can he truly be judged a source for insight into the mix of politics and intellectual life that

---

[149] Tim Hochstrasser, 'Jean Henri Samuel Formey (1711-97)', in Heiner F. Klemme and Manfred Kuehn, eds, *The Bloomsbury dictionary of eighteenth-century German philosophers* (London and New York, 2010), pp. 225-227.
[150] Alexander Schmidt, 'Scholarship, morals and government: Jean-Henri-Samuel Formey's and Johann Gottfried Herder's responses to Rousseau's *First Discourse*', *Modern Intellectual History*, 9 (2012), pp. 249-274.
[151] Margarete G. Smith, 'J. H. S. Formey, assiduous journalist and discreet propagandist of new scientific discoveries and philosophical trends', *Archives et Bibliotheques de Belgique*, 54 (1983), pp. 123-140.
[152] Margarete G. Smith, 'In defence of an eighteenth-century academician, philosopher and journalist: Jean-Henri Samuel Formey', *Studies on Voltaire and the eighteenth century*, Vol. 311 (Geneva, 1993), pp. 85-100.
[153] *Ibid.*, pp. 138-140.
[154] Boswell's Journal, 1 August 1764, in Danziger, ed, *James Boswell*, p. 56.
[155] MacDonogh, *Frederick the Great*, pp. 335-336. Thiébault's grandson was still recounting this story when he himself met Maximilian II, King of Bavaria, many years later. See Anon, 'Society at Munich', in *Bentley's Miscellany,* Vol. 49 (London, 1861), p. 548. Frederick's position on German culture and language is further explored in Chapter 6. As Voltaire had noted, German was only used in Prussia by soldiers and horses. See Blanning, *Frederick the Great,* p. 329.

Mitchell sought to carry out? As just noted, Thiébault observed Mitchell most frequently at court, and here the occasion for Mitchell's brand of diplomacy was probably lessened, if only by Frederick's common absence. It was shown at the outset of this section that the Berlin Academy of Sciences was pivotal for the interplay of intellectualism and politics in Frederick's Prussia. From 1765, Thiébault attended virtually every meeting of the Academy until his retirement in 1785. On his arrival he became acquainted with Mitchell and they probably bonded over the future and proceedings of the Academy.

Thiébault published his views on some of the most renowned members of the Academy in his *Original Anecdotes*. He eulogised the chemist A. S. Marggraf, who was to be a friend of Mitchell's in Berlin, and also wrote on the anatomist Meckel, also a friend to Mitchell.[156] In Chapter 5, the scientific connections forged by Mitchell will show him to have connected with Marggraf, and it will elaborate further on Mitchell's scientific friendship with Sulzer. Others closer to Frederick's orbit and that of the Berlin Academy also appear as friends of Mitchell. Patrick Murdoch wrote that Mitchell could be the intermediary in his letters to various personages related to Frederick and the Academy – Anthony Achard, pastor and confidant to Frederick the Great, was one of those. Achard had debated Frederick on theology when the latter was Prince of Prussia, and continued in close regard with Frederick. It is most certainly he whom Murdoch refers Mitchell to on a matter of patronage.[157] These exchanges probably occurred in private homes, where Mitchell welcomed these men or was welcomed into their homes. The content of their discussions are unknown, but their allegiances and beliefs can say more about how Mitchell perceived them, and whether or not they were true friendships, or friendships that yielded for him valuable diplomatic insight. Certainly, there is a mix of both in these connections.

While the French-led Berlin Academy of Sciences had Joseph-Louis Lagrange as Director in succession to Maupertuis, this section has shown that an undercurrent of hostility in German views on French involvement still ran through the Academy. By 1769, Johann Gottfried Herder was pronouncing that the decadent age of French culture was over, taking some of Frederick's favourites like Voltaire and d'Alembert with it.[158] While this was not strictly true until the end of Frederick's reign (at least when it came to the Academy), this section has also explored how Andrew Mitchell saw how politics and intellectual life combined in Frederick's mind, and how this played out in Berlin and in the Academy's internal and external relations. Mitchell proved adept at forming strong and helpful friendships in Berlin. On his travels, this was no less so. The next section explores Mitchell's knowledge links between Berlin and London, both by letter and in person.

---

156 Thiébault, *Original Anecdotes*, Vol. 2, Chapter V.
157 Dieudonné Thiébault, *Original Anecdotes of Frederic the Second, King of Prussia*, Vol. 1 (London, 1805), pp. 27-28; Patrick Murdoch to Mitchell, BL Add. MS 6840, 6 May 1763, f. 54; 2 January 1764, f. 67.
158 Blanning, *The culture of power*, pp. 256-257.

v. Modes of information transfer: Mitchell's knowledge network through letters and in person

The connections forged by Mitchell had, by 1764, joined to those he had long cultivated in Britain, to form a nexus of friendship and information. The conduct of the war meant that Mitchell accompanied Frederick on campaign, and the spaces in which he could conduct cultural diplomacy with Frederick were then limited to those occasions that allowed it. The response and ability of couriers to reach Mitchell and to ferry information in and out of the military theatres depended on the time of year and the exigencies of campaigning.

The very act of knowledge transfer is a spatial act which crosses borders and breaks down isolating cultural barriers.[159] Knowledge can only be transferred via a limited number of means, and a common feature in the understanding of knowledge transfer in the eighteenth century is what scholars see as the building of trust.[160] Natural philosophers and scholars were required to place their trust in the information they were provided. In other words, as Steven Shapin argues:

> A trust relationship is central to the very idea of empirical scientific knowledge. That relationship is inscribed in space: those who have not seen these things know them by trusting those who have, or by trusting those who have trusted those who have.[161]

Trying to define 'space' in this way – that it was both local and pan-continental, and that it produced knowledge that, because of limitations in transport, required implicit trust in order to accept – does not mean that it could take place anywhere, at any time. 'Space' was not the traversable geography of the Enlightenment ideas, but rather it pertains equally to the spaces in which Enlightenment occurred, and which were anchored to 'place'. Therefore, the location of knowledge production and transfer was important to whom it travelled with, and by what means.[162]

People like Andrew Mitchell could experience, understand, and diffuse knowledge in his own unique way, though it often conformed to standards of diplomatic reporting or, in his personal correspondence, the accepted obligations of the Republic of Letters. Even this 'nebulous' entity, Anne Goldgar has argued, had

---

[159] Daniel Brewer, 'Lights in space', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 37 (2004), p. 176.
[160] This expressed by Esther Mijers, who also cites Ann Goldgar on this point. See Esther Mijers, *'News from the Republick of Letters'*, pp. 16-17.
[161] Steven Shapin, 'Placing the view from nowhere: historical and sociological problems in the location of science', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 23 (1998), p. 8.
[162] Charles W. J. Withers, 'Place and the 'spatial turn' in geography and in history', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 70 (2009), p. 657n68.

no real definition and 'existed only in the minds of its members'.[163] Mitchell's transfer and receipt of knowledge was limited by the circumstance. However, even within the rooms of Frederick at Sans Souci or the Town Palace, the context of the meeting could set the tone for discussion and what Mitchell derived from it. That then influenced the content of his letters and what reached his correspondents.

The introduction of this chapter posed two questions: how and why did Andrew Mitchell decide to cultivate information networks in a foreign land and with a foreign academy? Following on from this, in what ways did it enhance or detract from his ability to conduct diplomacy? Chapters 2 and 3 explored the idea that while sociability and the pleasure of friendship were evident in Mitchell's early career, it certainly was no hindrance to the growth of his political career within and without the circles in which he moved. This chapter has thus far shown that in conducting diplomacy with Frederick, Mitchell was often put, by necessity or by Frederick's design, within reach of the intellectuals and learned men that he came to know well. It has shown that the foci of Mitchell's interests were men predominantly involved in the Berlin Academy of Sciences. While Mitchell sought these men out, Frederick's monarchical control of the Academy's direction and some of its output made this all the more necessary for successful diplomacy. The military campaigns of 1756-61, when Mitchell was most seriously in the field, left little time for the cultivation of networks. This did not eliminate him from participating the Republic of Letters, where, as Goldgar has argued, interest in this community of savants was enough to be a part of it.[164] Letters continued to be the primary means through which Mitchell grew his links to learned people in Prussia and in Britain, and he continued to be called upon by those people. The remainder of this section, as well as the following chapters, will explore Mitchell's continued participation in various kinds of information transfer, despite the demands of campaigning.

The creation and development of a network, as explored in the previous sections of this chapter, depended upon the periods in which Mitchell came into contact with those disposed to this type of friendship. His friends in Britain, particularly Patrick Murdoch, kept him informed of intellectual, philosophical, and scientific developments. Their letters are frequently mingled with news of British politics, and hopes for success for Frederick and Mitchell. The episode where German poets and intellects were introduced to Frederick in Leipzig in the winter of 1760-61 is an almost singular occasion when this could happen in person, though after the war Boswell's visit to Mitchell in Berlin is of particular note. The itinerancy of campaigning meant that Mitchell had to take hold of those moments when physical contact allowed friendships to grow. In most other instances, the growth of his network and the continuance of his interests in patronage and facilitation of science and literature, depended on letters.

His Berlin contacts, forged in the brief period of his residence and in the intervening occasions when he returned to Berlin (usually only by order of Frederick), included Sulzer, as well as the widows of Maupertuis and Lieberkühn. Letters continued to reach Mitchell from around Germany and Europe more

[163] Goldgar, *Impolite learning*, p. 2.
[164] Goldgar, *Impolite learning*, p. 3.

generally. During the war, letters arrived from one of his oldest friends Francesco Algarotti, from Heinrich Wilhelm Bachmann, and from the 'creepy' Abbe Giovanni Bastiani, a close favourite of Frederick.[165] From Britain, Millar continued corresponding with him, and letters survive from David Mallet, Thomas Birch, and William Rouet among many others. Eleanore de Maupertuis wrote only on reasons of patronage; a nephew of her deceased husband had landed in England without hope or prospects, and Eleanore begged Mitchell for his intercession on their behalf with his friends in England.[166] Yet the connection was important, as she was the lady in waiting to Princess Amalia, sister of Frederick the Great.[167] The widow of Lieberkühn wrote on a more serious note, and asked Mitchell's interest in the sale of her late husband's anatomical works. 'Knowing the friendship [Mitchell] had for my late husband', she wrote, had persuaded her to entreat Mitchell and Sulzer to approach the Royal Society in London, to purchase the works. Sulzer wrote in Eleanore's favour also, telling Mitchell that he surely was well aware of the use of this for his country and its Royal Society. He begged Mitchell's intervention to have the Society make the purchase, or to find a 'rich amateur' or an 'individual curious enough' to procure the works.[168]

Sulzer was writing from Berlin; the widows Lieberkühn and Maupertuis moved with the royal court to Magdeburg as they fled enemy armies, but the circulation of information, patronage, and friendship continued. After the war, Mitchell, Sulzer, Prussian Carl Friedrich Ernst von Cocceji – son of Frederick's late chancellor Samuel von Cocceji – and Henry Fuseli travelled together to Spa in order to rest, recuperate and take the waters.[169] Sulzer's correspondence with Mitchell, and indeed the assistance in its continuance provided by Alexander Burnet, is a subject of discussion in Chapter 5 in the light of its implications for

---

[165] Blanning, *Frederick the Great*, p. 445. Bachmann was a merchant who took a strong interest in literary patronage. He founded a 'topographical society' in Magdeburg in the late 1760s where he cultivated literary knowledge and discussion, and was known to Lessing and Gleim. See Hugh Barr Nisbet, *Gotthold Ephraim Lessing: His life, works, and thought* (Oxford, 2013), p. 381. Bachmann was also tutored by Johann Georg Sulzer, and this may be how the connection was forged with Mitchell. See Darrell M. Berg, *The correspondence of Christian Gottfried Krause: A music lover in the age of sensibility* (Farnham and Burlington, 2009), p. 256.

[166] Eleanore de Maupertuis (née von Borck) to Mitchell, 11 October 1761, BL Add. MS 6858, f. 135.

[167] MacDonogh, *Frederick the Great*, p. 186.

[168] Sulzer to Mitchell, 17 October 1761, BL Add. MS 6858, ff. 139-140.

[169] The number of Cocceji family members in Prussian service makes this identification difficult. Samuel von Cocceji had three sons, the eldest being Carl Ludwig (1724-1808, who married the dancer known as Barberina), the middle being Johann Heinrich Friedrich (1725-1785) followed by Carl Friedrich Ernst (1728-1780). See Johann Friedrich Seyfart, *Lebens- und Regierungs-Geschichte Friedrichs des andern Königs in Preussen*, Part 2 (Leipzig, 1786), p. 243. The case for Mitchell's companion being the latter is based on suggestions that he had served in the Prussian Army during the war, and went to abroad without permission sometime before 1770, as a result of which his estates were confiscated. See Rolf Straubel, *Biographisches Handbuch der preußischen Verwaltungs- und Justizbeamten 1740-1806/15*, Part 1, *Biographien A-L* (München, 2009), p. 172. Mitchell wrote to Newcastle in March 1761 sending turnip seeds with 'Cocceij [sic] the younger, who is extremely sensible of your Grace's goodness to him during his stay in England'. See Mitchell to Newcastle, 22 March 1761, in Bisset, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, p. 225. Mitchell also wrote to Bute that Cocceji had passed on to him the King's intention (based on a personal meeting with Cocceji) to make him a Knight of the Bath. See Mitchell to Bute, 29 April 1761, in Bisset, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, p. 231. In a letter to Mitchell from his friend George Lewis Scott in 1761, Scott says the letter is carried by 'Cocceij' [sic], and only one of the brothers is known to have been to Britain. See George Lewis Scott to Andrew Mitchell, 24 November 1760, BL Add. MS 6858, f. 45^{r}-46^{v}. Moreover, Johann Friedrich was in Sweden receiving letters from Frederick, where the former was Prussian envoy, at the time that Mitchell was at Spa with 'Cocceji', meaning Johann Heinrich Friedrich cannot have been the brother who accompanied Mitchell. See *Pol. Corr.*, Vol. 23, Frederick to Johann Heinrich Friedrich, 25 September 1764, p. 499.

science. Much more about the manner of the conduct of Mitchell's information network can be understood by looking at letters to Mitchell from William Rouet, travelling tutor to Charles, Lord Hope, the eldest son of John Hope, second Earl of Hopetoun. Rouet was also to tutor Charles's brother James Hope-Johnstone, who became heir to his father when Charles died in 1766.

Rouet's correspondence with Mitchell demonstrates several factors aligning with the ideas put forward in this part of the chapter. Namely, that the two-way dialogue Mitchell conducted between Prussia and Britain continued even when his correspondents were on continental Europe, and that this represented a different space of 'Enlightenment'; and that, in broader terms, the cultural understanding of his diplomacy was circumstantial and that he acted when ideas were passed to him, or when he posited them with his correspondents. Rouet (born c. 1720) was an academic raised in Glasgow, who matriculated to the university in 1730, subsequently became a clergyman, and by 1744, was on a shortlist of highly promising teaching candidates put together by Frances Hutcheson for Lord Minto in consideration of the vacant Professorship of Moral Philosophy at Glasgow.[170] The elevation of Rouet via patronage was even more instrumental in his appointment and rapid career rise than it was in the formation of Andrew Mitchell's career. Success by relation and by patronage was a great factor in Rouet's elevation, whatever his skills as an Orientalist (the post he later held). He enjoyed the patronage of the Duke of Argyll, his cousin became rector of the University in 1753, and he had been travelling tutor to the son of the rector who oversaw his appointment to the Professorship of Oriental Languages in 1751.[171]

Rouet had only intermittently taught at Glasgow. He had succeeded to the chair of Ecclesiastical History in 1752, but was much employed in London on university legal business from 1753 to 1756. Furthermore, in 1759 he became embroiled in a controversy over salary and employment when he wanted to become travelling tutor to Charles Hope while maintaining his teaching position.[172] He accordingly left for the continent in 1759 and by 1760 was corresponding with Andrew Mitchell, though this did not prevent him pursuing the Principalship of the university in 1761.[173] Rouet was an accomplished scholar of ancient and modern history, and was very up to date on the discussions over the future of Poland, something that, along with his European tour, may have brought him into the orbit of Andrew Mitchell.[174]

Mitchell's contact with Rouet begins, so far as their surviving correspondence tells us, in 1760 when Rouet was in Warsaw with his charge. In this and subsequent letters, Rouet is optimistic that Mitchell can introduce Hope to Frederick; something Boswell also hoped for three years later. Both Hope and Boswell's wishes were dashed. Hope and Rouet were diverted by the movements of the Austrian army and the uncertainty following the death of George II, and Boswell failed because both Mitchell and Burnet

---

[170] Peter Jones, 'The Scottish professoriate and the polite academy', in Istvan Hont and Michael Ignatieff, eds, *Wealth and virtue: The shaping of political economy in the Scottish enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1983), p. 104.
[171] Emerson, *Academic patronage*, p. 122.
[172] The University of Glasgow, 'William Rouet', at http://www.universitystory.gla.ac.uk/biography/?id=WH2238&type=P, accessed 3 August 2017.
[173] Emerson, *Academic Patronage*, pp. 151-152.
[174] Jones, 'The Scottish professoriate', p. 104.

feared what embarrassing statements he might make to Frederick. Burnet wrote Mitchell that '[Boswell] makes so absurd Distinctions betwixt Englishmen and Scotchmen, which are increased and strengthened by what [Lord Marischal] says to him, that I am certain something very ridiculous would happen on that Occasion'.[175] Many British, including Boswell, saw Mitchell, Burnet and Lord Marischal as the gatekeepers to Frederick, being Scots merely adding to Boswell's dismay at his lack of presentation.[176] Rouet made no such fuss about himself, but Mitchell wrote to him at Utrecht, where Rouet took his charge in order to study Civil Law and Moral Philosophy upon Mitchell's recommendation. From there he communicated to Mitchell the mathematician Robert Simson's book on Euclid. 'The obliging offer you desir'd me to make in yr name to my worthy friend honest Robert Simson, produc'd [that] agreeable effect which I expected, in filling him with great joy & gratitude to you', Rouet wrote Mitchell. Simson, like many, saw Frederick as the beacon of hope for the military and intellectual defence of liberty in Europe. Rouet conveyed Simson's thoughts on Frederick, writing '… the Political Enthusiasm for the great Hero of the age is in him join'd to an admiration of his great Literary talents'. Simson was filled with joy that Mitchell 'was so obliging as to propose presenting [the book] to the King in [Simson's] name'. Simson's rapture was transcribed verbatim by Rouet further: 'It was very kind in you to mention my great regard & veneration for his Majesty to Mr Mitchell & most obliging in him to resolve to offer Euclid to him as from myself … I request you will let him know, how warm & sincere, my gratefull [sic] resentment of his favours is & ever will be'. Simson averred to Mitchell's intimate connection to Frederick. He requested that Mitchell edit Simson's dedication and make adjustments. 'Would I could do it but half so well as [Mitchell] could do it', Simson told Rouet, 'supposing him a private man, with the abilities he has'.[177]

For Rouet, it was clear that Mitchell was Frederick's 'Achates', an allusion to the ever-faithful, 'prompt and resourceful' companion of Aeneas in Virgil's *Aeneid*.[178] In this position of privilege and intimacy with the King and the court, Mitchell both received information about Britain, its politics, and its famous figures, and acted as a form of focal point for British perceptions of Frederick and Prussia. Rouet sent news of Scottish political changes in the wake of Argyll's death, and conjectured on his own future career prospects, which he thought had deteriorated due to a lengthy stay on the continent.[179] Rouet provided updates on politicians, and their cultural activities. Bute had 'got £300 per annum settled on Hume [sic] the author of several plays'; Bute had also sent his son to Geneva with Colonel Edmonstone, an

[175] For Hope and Rouet's diversion, see Rouet to Mitchell, undated c. November 1760, BL Add. MS 6840, f. 116. For Boswell, see Burnet to Mitchell, 8 September 1764, Bundle 86, Burnett of Kemnay Papers.
[176] Burnet added to Mitchell that '[Boswell] imagined through [Marischal's] means, he should have seen and talked with KP [Frederick] with the greatest freedom & familiarity, otherwise he would never have accompanied him to Berlin.' See Burnet to Mitchell, 8 September 1764, Bundle 86, Burnett of Kemnay Papers.
[177] Rouet to Mitchell, Utrecht, March 13 1761, BL Add. MS 6840, ff. 120-121. Underlinings are Rouet's own. The 'resentment' mentioned was in the eighteenth century understood as taking something either 'well or ill'. See entries for 'Resent' and 'Resentment' in Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language*, 10th ed. (London, 1792).
[178] Rouet to Mitchell, 9 June 1761, BL Add. MS 6840, f. 124r. See also Wendell V. Clausen, *Virgil's Aeneid: Decorum, allusion, and ideology* (Leipzig, 2002), pp. 15-17; another author more closely equates Achates with Aeneas as the latter's *alter ego*, his "anxiety' which is the companion of kings'. See Sergio Casali, 'The king of pain: Aeneas, Achates and 'Achos' in 'Aeineid' 1', *The Classical Quarterly*, 58 (2008), p. 183.
[179] Rouet to Mitchell, 27 August 1761, BL Add. MS 6840, ff. 126r-127v.

appointment that owed much to William Pitt's intervention;[180] and gave updates on Mitchell's friend 'Old Montague' as well as on the social rumours surrounding Bute and his family.[181]

Rouet's correspondence with Mitchell encompassed culture, information, and politics; the three driving interests in Mitchell's diplomatic career. Rouet's time in Utrecht enabled him to provide Mitchell close insight into the social politics surrounding Mary Wortley Montagu's return to Britain. Rouet then moved on to Vienna, where he continued to provide Mitchell close intelligence from the court, and where he dined with the great Chancellor Anton Wenzel von Kaunitz. In Utrecht, Rouet struck up a correspondence with Mitchell's friend Henri de Catt, the reader to Frederick. Rouet thought Catt's poetry 'dead bad'[182] and after some time in Ratisbon, returned to Utrecht where he was in a position to comment on the Montagu family's public entanglements. Rouet passed on the newest gossip: that 'old sapho' [sic] had stayed for some time at Rotterdam, and had left two volumes of her letters to be posthumously published there. Rouet wrote 'a gentleman who read several of them told me, they are of a piece of the whole of her past life, curious but odd & extravagant'. What was more curious, for Rouet, was that 'her son was at Leyden at some time consulting and transcribing Arabic MSS in the library, did not go 5 leagues to see his mother, but is gone into Arabia, Egypt and with a very shattered constitution. Such an odd family is to be found nowhere but in England.[183]

A year and a half later, Rouet had moved to the court at Vienna with Hope, and told Mitchell of the esteem held for him there. Mitchell had met Kaunitz during his time in Brussels in the early in 1752-53, negotiating for a new Barrier Treaty, and Kaunitz recalled him fondly.[184] As Rouet wrote Mitchell, 'even the great Minister himself has upon several occasions expressed both to me and in public his high esteem & regard for you, & remembers you with pleasure from your first connections together at Brussels'. Rouet added, moreover, that Kaunitz said 'many obliging things' of Mitchell and saw much of the latter in Rouet.[185] Rouet gave Mitchell little hope for Vienna's political reconciliation with Prussia and Britain, but added that Count Poniatowski and the Austrian diplomat Johann Wenzel von Widmann still held Mitchell in high regard.[186] The final letter of Rouet to Mitchell serves to tie these motivations together, demonstrating the capacity of his network to function across space and place, but also straddle politics, society, and intellectual life. The topics of note, accordingly, are wide. The Archduchess Isabella had died,

[180] The son being John Stuart, later 1st Marquess of Bute. He would later meet Boswell in Italy. See Hesketh Pearson, *Boswell and Johnson: The story of their lives* (London, 1958).
[181] Rouet to Mitchell, 13 March 1761, BL Add MS 6480, f. 122r. The 'Hume' mentioned here is John Home, writer and poet.
[182] *Ibid.*
[183] Rouet to Mitchell, 26 April 1762, BL Add. MS 6840, ff. 130-131.
[184] A short summary of Mitchell's diplomatic mission to Brussels is given in Doran, *Andrew Mitchell*, p. 11. More context and focus on Kaunitz's political intentions and those of Austria, in relation to Anglo-Austrian relations and the Barrier Treaty, can be found in McGill, 'The Roots of policy'.
[185] Rouet to Mitchell, 17 September 1763, BL Add. MS 6840, ff. 135-136.
[186] *Ibid.*

Rouet wrote, leaving her husband Joseph devastated.[187] There was also more news of Poniatowski as a candidate for the Kingdom of Poland. The bulk of the letter is filled with news of the intellectual world in which Rouet and Mitchell corresponded. Robert Wood, whose writing on Palmyra Mitchell had patronised in 1753, was retiring from his government position, and intended to write 'some further narrations of his eastern travels'. With the news, Rouet transmitted a book on antiquities by Gronovius and Graevius, and one on Italian antiquities by Muratori.[188] Finally, Rouet said, there was news of Mitchell's friend Hume, who had gone to Paris as secretary to Lord Hertford. Rouet informed Mitchell that 'some people say his Lordship has … an annuity of £300 for life upon [Hume], as a General Director of his children's education, others say he goes over barely as a traveller to live in the Ambassador's house & to be provided to by the Government afterwards'.[189]

vi. Conclusion

This chapter has explored the growth of Andrew Mitchell's network of correspondents, contacts, and acquaintances. It has sought to lay the foundation for a deeper exploration of this area of his career by locating the central areas in which these contacts and interactions played out. In doing so, it has argued for the understanding that Mitchell's proximity to Frederick both personally and politically shaped, in many ways, his capacity to operate as a conduit of cultural exchange between and within Britain and Prussia. The more consequential friendships he formed have been touched upon here, and will be further explored, such as those with Patrick Murdoch, Johann Georg Sulzer, and indeed Frederick II. Those peripheral friendships with others give rise to further information about these friendships, such as information provided by Burnet, Lehndorff, Thiébault, Catt, and d'Argens.

The investigation into Mitchell and the Berlin Academy of Sciences also lay the foundation for a greater understanding of Mitchell's links to that institution, which became a key area of interest throughout his time in Berlin. It was from these links that many British and Prussian intellectuals made or exchanged advances. The chapter has argued that Frederick's vision and personality pervaded the Academy, and that despite often showing a disinterest in the more minor squabbles in the Academy, he was determined to maintain it as an extension, and as a demonstration, of his political and intellectual strength. Through moving closer to the Academy and its members, Mitchell was able to secure a closer position to Frederick himself.

---

[187] Rouet to Mitchell, 30 November 1763, BL Add. MS 6840, ff. 137^{r}-138^{v}. An excellent discussion on the nature of Joseph's marriage to Isabella, and their complex feelings toward one another and themselves, can be found in Derek Beales, *Joseph II*, Vol. 1, *In the shadow of Maria Theresa 1741-1780* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 77-79.
[188] More on Muratori's reception in Britain can be found in D. Hay, 'Muratori and the British historians', *Renaissance Essays* (London, 1988), pp. 85-102.
[189] Rouet to Mitchell, 30 November 1763, BL Add MS 6840, f. 138.

This chapter has placed Andrew Mitchell has expanded on the intellectual and political areas of Mitchell's career. It serves to also provide context through which the following chapters on his literary and scientific activities can be understood. This chapter has shown how Mitchell identified a personal relationship with Frederick as key to his success in Berlin, and that others, such as Williams, who did not make this connection suffered for it.

Chapter 5

The 'intermediary' Andrew Mitchell: Science between Berlin and London

i. Introduction

The previous chapter examined how Andrew Mitchell went about establishing an intellectual network between Britain and Prussia. It argued that he operated effectively in a codified and hierarchical world to produce his own network within the wider Republic of Letters. This chapter examines one of the key areas of Mitchell's extra-diplomatic activities in more detail: his involvement in natural science, its instruments, its production, research, and publication. Mitchell's other key contribution to the world of literature between Britain and Prussia will be the subject of Chapter 6.

Mitchell was well aware of the 'Republic of Letters', for he had seen and experienced its workings on his Grand Tour, and was obviously aware of the flow of literature, knowledge, and friendships between Britain and the continent. This he had demonstrated with his roles in the Royal Society, the Society of Dilettanti, and other societies. His place as a British diplomat in Berlin was unique, as one of only a handful of Britons in the higher social stratum of Berlin society at that time. The burgeoning interest in British science and literature in Berlin affords a good opportunity to examine what Mitchell's role might have been in this, and how he might have made some impact on these worlds. As noted, Mitchell's long involvement with the Royal Society had exposed him to the very latest and most technical scientific research, and his nominations for Fellows of the Society show an interest in promoting pan-European networks of knowledge. This interest was not lessened when he went to Berlin. Rather, it became more focused due to his friendships and the interests of those friends in areas such as astronomy, chemistry, medicine and anatomy.

This chapter begins by defining Mitchell as an 'intermediary', someone who created linkages in the Republic of Letters but was not necessarily a producer of knowledge in their own right. It argues that Mitchell's role as an intermediary in Berlin is all the more important because of the differing approaches to science in Britain and Berlin. I argue that Mitchell possessed an authority in relation to knowledge on his arrival in Berlin that was only enhanced during his time there and as the competence and confidence of German intellectuals grew. His friendships with Johann Georg Sulzer and Patrick Murdoch were most conducive to growing Prusso-British links, but this chapter shows that Mitchell also transcended these friendships in order to grow his network and facilitate the expansion of knowledge and its networks.

ii. Knowledge and authority: Andrew Mitchell as an intermediary for science in the Republic of Letters

This thesis has thus far sought to place Andrew Mitchell at a crossroads of intellectual development in Prussia and Britain, which was closely linked to his diplomatic posting. Chapter 4 demonstrated Mitchell's ability and willingness to cultivate strong intellectual friendships with Prussian learned men, and how he maintained this alongside his political and diplomatic contacts in Britain. Chapter 5 seeks to narrow the focus to Mitchell's scientific interests. More specifically, it seeks to highlight his role as an 'intermediary' in a codified and structured world of protocol that made up the Republic of Letters.

What did it mean to be an 'intermediary', and why does Andrew Mitchell fit this categorisation so well? Anne Goldgar's work on the Republic of Letters has demonstrated the interdependence of men of varying social strata, from the most high-profile men of the Republic, to those just setting out on their scholarly path. At its core, as Goldgar points out, the Republic of Letters was a world of people as much as scholarship, and viewing 'the conduct of personal relationships as fundamental to the Republic of Letters lets us see its behaviours in a new light'.[1] This is not to subordinate the scholarship produced, but rather to place scholarship and the personal conduct of this world on an equal footing. It is critical to note here that the Republic of Letters evolved over time, most strongly in the seventeenth century, and by the middle of the eighteenth century had grown to critical mass. Goldgar's narrative shows a world at once strengthened by new and exciting scholarship, and at the same time working to maintain the protocol of previous decades. One of the lasting features of the Republic of Letters, then, was its adherence to modesty and introductions from verified scholars and sources. In this, the 'intermediary' was key to much of the networking that occurred in this scholarly universe.

The intermediary of the Republic of Letters provided a most valuable service, facilitating introductions and exchanges of letters and information. On a more conceptual note, they also had what Goldgar sees as a 'sociological meaning'; they had a place in the codified system of joining and corresponding with individuals and societies, and were sometimes responsible for success (or failure) in the Republic of Letters.[2] The intermediary was thus not merely a conduit. The service they provided between scholars and institutions verified those places in the Republic of Letters, potentially increased the status and exposure of the participants, and also served to ameliorate the rudeness or abasement that took place between scholars in the absence of an intermediary. 'By arranging help for a scholar', Goldgar argues, '[the intermediary] forged or hardened links with the person served, while at the same time reinforcing his

[1] Goldgar, *Impolite learning*, p. 10.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 30-32.

reciprocal ties with the final provider of the service'.[3] The intermediary was crucial to success or failure, often on account of their mediating function in bringing together scholars of different abilities, classes, and societies.

In the subsequent parts of this chapter I will address Mitchell's fulfilment of these functions, particularly in linking researchers, authors, and producers of knowledge. In particular, it brings into focus Mitchell's involvement in the scientific world of Britain and Prussia, the latter of which centred on Berlin. Returning to Goldgar's central assumption (being that the intermediary was likely to bring about successful linkages in most cases), not all present day historians see modesty and acknowledgement of class and status as the keys to advancement in the Republic of Letters. There are examples of scholars turning their backs on the Republic of Letters in the mid-eighteenth century. As Kasper Risbjerg Eskildsen asserted, by the middle of the century, many in Germany began to see the Republic of Letters as a thing of the past, as many rebelled against the label of 'Republic' for a collective that they deemed hierarchical and competitive in a negative sense. Eskildsen argues that this did not happen all over Europe, and locates this disenchantment most strongly occurring in Germany and Scandinavia. Moreover, Eskildsen cites Lessing, widely seen as a key proponent of German Enlightenment, who in his *Junge Gelehrte* 'ridiculed [the Republic of Letters] as a historical epic relic of the learned imagination, long overcome by specialised academics, worldly philosophers, and law-abiding civil servants'.[4] Robert Mayhew has also noted the 'pressure of 'professionalism' and the crystallisation of an agreed culture of scientific practice', in the same way that Goldgar also notes the increased pressure that the rise of learned institutions put on the cultural practices of the seventeenth and early eighteenth century.[5] Daniel Roche sees the 'Republic of Science' as a 'department' of the Republic of Letters, one which, in France at least, the members themselves defined the rules for membership and '[barred] the door to the half-educated',[6] whereas Ad Maas has noted some productive crossover between amateurs and the university professors.[7]

Whichever view one subscribes to, it was clear that engaging in scientific practices, in addition to the accumulation of scientific curiosities, had for some time been 'status-laden activities'. Likewise, as Huib J. Zuidervaart recognises, the entry to learned societies 'gave its bearer an almost aristocratic aura, and – through this – more prestige and a more respectable social status'. This further defines the importance of modesty, propriety, and adherence to protocol in one's conduct in the Republic of Letters; fraudulent, overly proud, or boasting savants were clearly seen to be missing the vitality of respectable scholarship.[8] The sociability of the Republic of Letters depended very strongly on the continuity of names, acquaintances,

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 31-32.
[4] Kasper Risbjerg Eskildsen, 'How Germany left the Republic of Letters', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 65 (2004), pp. 427-429.
[5] Robert Mayhew, 'Mapping science's imagined community: Geography as a Republic of Letters, 1600-1800', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, 38 (2005), p. 91; Goldgar, *Impolite Learning*, p. 51.
[6] Daniel Roche, *France in the Enlightenment*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge, MA and London, 1998), p. 513.
[7] Ad Maas, 'Civil scientists: Dutch scientists between 1750 and 1875', *History of Science*, 48 (2010), p. 84.
[8] Huib J. Zuidervaart, "A plague to the learned world': Pieter Gabry, F. R. S. (1715-1770) and his use of natural philosophy to gain prestige and social status', *History of Science*, 45 (2007), pp. 287-326.

and authority. As Karl Hufbauer states, 'When educated men esteemed a science, they were likely to follow its developments, embrace its doctrines, acclaim its participants, and respect its patrons', and powerful men would 'reward its participants, and finance its instruction'.[9] Not only did it have a 'sociological meaning' as Goldgar noted, but it also has a political function in the sense of the equation of 'philosophical knowledge' and 'social authority' so clearly drawn out by Jan Golinski.[10] Golinski also argued that claims to theoretical knowledge, allied with practical knowledge, added legitimacy and authority in a broader societal context.[11] Here there is a difficult arrangement of what Daniel Roche calls 'internalist' views on the comprehension of learned – specifically, scientific – communities, 'who want to explain changes in science from within', and those he terms 'externalist', 'who invoke sociological considerations and the historical context'.[12] The political linkages so commonly made in Mitchell's letters and in letters to him from friends will bear this difficulty out. The frequent decisions to be made in the sharing of information took into account localised as well as Prusso-British contexts. Often situations arose in his correspondence which, although his correspondents could write freely on politicisation in science, clearly had to be treated with care in relation to their place in the greater consideration of society and science. It is clear, however, that authority could be conferred on those with a knowledge of the sciences in any particular instance, and that knowledge of the essential principles of any given discipline was enough to grant 'authority upon gentlemen to direct a multitude of different practical activities'.[13]

The changing nature of the Republic of Letters thus had consequences for the structure of that 'imagined community'.[14] Benedict Anderson's now widely used term has perhaps not had the clear delineation that it deserves, or perhaps was intended to have. Proposing 'imagined community' to explain the sensing of growth and change in nationalism within one or more states, Anderson noted that 'inequality and exploitation may prevail' in any given community, but that 'the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship'. Anderson saw this latter definition as the reason many persisted 'with such limited imaginings' when negative forces were often prevailing in society. The Republic of Letters had, since the Renaissance, developed as a community of like-minded men, communicating in Latin. This persisted until the rise of popular vernacular cultures in learning, in the eighteenth century. French, followed by English and German, became equally important languages as the original template for the Republic of Letters made

[9] Karl Hufbauer, *The formation of the German chemical community (1720-1795)* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1982), p. 13.
[10] J. V. Golinski, 'Utility and audience in eighteenth-century chemistry: Case studies of William Cullen and Joseph Priestley', *British Journal for the History of Science*, 21 (1988), pp. 1-31. Elements of this work also usefully appear in J. R. R. Christie and J. V. Golinski, 'The spreading of the word: New directions in the historiography of chemistry 1600-1800', *History of Science*, 20 (1982), pp. 235-266.
[11] Jan Golinski, 'Chemistry in the Scientific Revolution: Problems of language and communication', in David C. Lindberg and Robert S. Westman, eds, *Reappraisals of the Scientific Revolution* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 389-390.
[12] Roche, *France in the Enlightenment*, p. 507.
[13] Golinski, 'Utility and audience', p. 11.
[14] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*, rev. ed. (London and New York, 2006), p. 7.

way for a more cosmopolitan idea of scholarly networking.[15] Scholars examining the eighteenth century have been keen to co-opt the 'imagined community' to explain any number of instances of networking or contact. This is contestable, however, particularly since a number of scholars identify a movement against the pan-European community of scholars from the middle of the century.

William Clark argued that the 'network of class and cast boundaries' that made up pan-European networks were particularly 'endogamous' and 'intramural' in the major learned centres of Britain, Germany and elsewhere.[16] Roy Porter reinforced this argument in the same tome when he argued that 'the battle lines of chemistry and the science of life … largely followed national loyalties'.[17] Porter's qualification 'largely' is essential here. It was not always the case that scholars of the same nationality were self-supporting, or that one state produced more identifiably 'important' scholars than another. Contradictions can and did occur. For example, in the battle for acknowledgement as the originator of his theory of least action, Maupertuis, the French leader of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, could count on the support of Leonhard Euler, a Swiss, against the claims of Samuel König, a Hessian raised in Switzerland, that Leibniz, a Saxon, came up with the theory.[18] In France the Comte de Buffon's blatant discrediting of his countryman Jean-Antoine Nollet over electrical theory shows that even shared nationality was not a guarantee of a harmonious or even identifiable 'comradeship'.[19] While there is certainly vast scholarly evidence to show that scholars in this period communicated and worked with a shared sense of knowledge production, advancement, and learned dialogue, what I seek to suggest here is a counter-flow of suspicion about the benefits of participating in a pan-European network of ideas.[20] It is clear that the blank application of 'imagined community' to the Republic of Letters of Mitchell's time is problematic. It is by noting continuity *and* change in the working of the learned community that we can best make out a picture of Mitchell's activities and their motivations, just as it is more generally to the scholarly community of the mid-eighteenth century. Perhaps, then, the most effective approach to our consideration of Mitchell's role and activities is to ascribe no prevailing ideology or membership of any 'imagined community', but rather to see his place, and the places of those he recognised and assisted, as contingent. Furthermore, participation in the Republic of Letters was always dependent on one's contributions and willingness to participate; doing so was voluntary, and so why Mitchell participated, and what he was able to facilitate as an intermediary, is made all the more significant because of that voluntary nature.

---

[15] Per Pippin Aspaas, 'The use of Latin and the European Republic of Letters: Change and continuity in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries', *Nordlit*, 33 (2014), pp. 281-295.
[16] William Clark, 'The pursuit of the prosopography of science', in Roy Porter, ed, *The Cambridge history of science*, Vol. 4, *Eighteenth-century science* (Cambridge, 2003), p. 234.
[17] Roy Porter, 'Introduction', in Porter, ed, *Cambridge history of science*, p. 13.
[18] Calinger, 'The Newtonian-Wolffian Controversy', pp. 324-327.
[19] Here battle lines were drawn over competing philosophical systems, namely Newtonianism and Cartesianism. See J. L. Heilbron, *Electricity in the 17th & 18th centuries: A study of early modern physics* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1979), particularly Part IV: The age of Franklin.
[20] While I speak here of pan-European networks in order to focus my point, Jan Golinski and others have extended this globally. See Jan Golinski, 'Science *in* the Enlightenment, revisited', *History of Science*, 49 (2011), pp. 217-231.

iii. The intermediary at work: the flow of instruments and information between Prussia and Britain

On 31 October 1761, the eminent scholar Johann Georg Sulzer wrote to Andrew Mitchell, thanking him effusively for delivering a particularly valuable, state-of-the-art piece of scientific equipment into Sulzer's hands.[21] The instruments, which will be discussed in this section, included an invaluable telescope by John Dollond, as well as pocket 'perspectives' by the same maker. First, some more information on Sulzer will add context here. Sulzer was a member of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, Professor of Mathematics at the Berlin Joachimsthalchen Gymnasium, and the author of two major works on aesthetics.[22] Sulzer was occupied in many areas of scholarship including botany, astronomy, music, and later, as Director of the 'speculative philosophy' section of the Academy, also focused on psychology and ethics.[23] His reputation would also have preceded him as a co-founder of the well-known Berlin Monday Club, which in the 1750s included the poet Ramler, as well as the publisher Friedrich Nicolai and writer Gotthold Lessing.[24] Scholarly work on Sulzer's life and career is usually limited to his writing, and the subsequent reception of, his *Allgemeine Theorie der Schönen Künste*, or General Theory of Polite Arts (as Charles Burney translated it), published between 1771 and 1774. But Sulzer had long been a recognised and illustrious member of Berlin intellectual life. In 1755 he had translated David Hume's *Enquiry concerning human understanding* into German, and had an interest in British philosophy and writing, particularly that of Shaftesbury.[25] Writing a preface to a translation of Hume's *Enquiry concerning human understanding*, Sulzer praised him as a model philosopher, who he hoped would stir Germans from their philosophical slumber.[26] While Sulzer did not have a

[21] Sulzer to Mitchell, 31 October 1761, BL Add. MS 6861, ff. 144-145.
[22] Johannes W. Müller, 'Sulzer, Johann Georg', in *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, 25 (2013), pp. 702-703, at https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz22694.html#ndbcontent, accessed 9 January 2018.
[23] Henry and Mary Garland, *The Oxford companion to German literature* (Oxford, 1976), pp. 839-840; Johan van der Zande, 'Orpheus in Berlin: A reappraisal of Johann Georg Sulzer's theory of the polite arts', *Central European History*, 28 (1995), pp. 175-208; Matthew Riley, 'Cultivating the savage: Johann Georg Sulzer and the 'aesthetic force' of music', *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 127 (2002), pp. 1-22.
[24] H. P. Rickman, ed and trans., *W. Dilthey. Selected Writings* (Cambridge, 1976), p. 69. Some place him rather as an occasional guest than a leading light in the club. See Nisbet, *Gotthold Ephraim Lessing*, pp. 156-157.
[25] Udo Thiel, *The early modern subject: Self-consciousness and personal identity from Descartes to Hume* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 355, 380. Other work has sought to clarify Sulzer's significance between Wolff and Hume, both philosophically and chronologically. See a report on the conference on Sulzer held in 2009 in Halle: Maximilian Johannes Benz, 'Johann Georg Sulzer. Aufklärung zwischen Christian Wolff und David Hume *(Internationale Arbeitsagung in Halle [Saale] v. 12-14.2.2009)*, *Zeitschrift für Germanistik*, 19 (2009), pp. 639-641. The subsequent publication is Frank Grunert and Gideon Stiening, eds, *Johann Georg Sulzer (1720-1779). Aufklärer zwischen Christian Wolff und David Hume* (Berlin, 2011), which also contains the note to Sulzer's Hume translation on page 14; for Sulzer's interest in Shaftesbury, see Manfred Kuehn, 'Introduction', in Heiner F. Klemme and Manfred Kuehn, eds, *The reception of British aesthetics in Germany: Seven significant translations, 1745-1776*, Vol. 1 (Bristol, 2001), pp. x-xx; Alexandra Kosenina and Richie Robertson, 'Lessing as journalist and controversialist', in Richie Robertson, ed, *Lessing and the German enlightenment* (Oxford, 2013), p. 45.
[26] Manfred Kuehn, *Scottish common sense in Germany, 1768-1800: A contribution to the history of critical philosophy* (Kingston and Montreal, 1987), p. 40.

monopoly on Hume – many others got hold of translations of his works, also available in French – the friendship of Mitchell with Hume was surely also conducive to his befriending and coming to be so fond of Sulzer.[27] Sulzer subscribed to the ideas of Christian Wolff, which placed him firmly among the ideological battlefields of mid-century Berlin learned men.[28] While he might not have always agreed with Hume's ideas, no doubt some debate might have occurred between him and Mitchell on the subject of the great Scottish philosopher.

Sulzer believed, in sum, that artworks could have a 'mnemonic' function, that could be used as universal symbols to persuade citizens that their civilisation was beautiful, but also fragile. He demonstrated this interest in the didactic power of imagery while accruing his first debt to Andrew Mitchell during the Seven Years' War. Here, Mitchell introduced Sulzer to Frederick in Leipzig in early 1761, when Sulzer wanted to commemorate the siege defence by Heinrich van der Heyde at Colberg in 1760.[29] The defence was considered by Sulzer to be an important patriotic act, and a symbolic gesture of support for Frederick and the defence of his adopted Prussian homeland.[30] This artistic enterprise underscored a deeper commitment to the role of the arts in society, and its ability to be a weapon of politics. As Hufbauer has argued, a greater commitment to given scientific values will occur if men saw these values as aligning with their own aspirations.[31] For Sulzer, science, too, could demonstrate the civilised and polite progress of men, and his extant letters to Mitchell make reference to the physical proofs that science and the arts could make to rulers in the political sphere.[32] His optimism was expressed to Frederick the Great when the latter asked him about the character of men. 'Since we have built on the principle that man is good by nature', Sulzer told him, 'things are going to get better'.[33] It reinforced his thinking that politics was interwoven into considerations of understanding and the purpose of knowledge.

Sulzer's letter to Mitchell of 31 October 1761 opens several avenues of enquiry. First, there is the necessary question of why Sulzer believed Mitchell could fulfil the intermediary roles that Sulzer asked of him. Mitchell's history of membership in learned societies in Britain had certainly come to bear on his time

---

[27] The importance of British philosophers and writers in German translation has been partially explored, despite their acknowledged importance and reception in Germany. See Heiner F. Klemme and Manfred Kuehn, 'General Introduction', in Klemme and Kuehn, eds, *The reception of British aesthetics in Germany*.

[28] Manfred Kuehn, 'The reception of Hume in Germany', in Peter Jones, ed, *The reception of David Hume in Europe* (London and New York, 2005), pp. 98-138.

[29] In a letter to Frederick of April 1761, the Marquis d'Argens mentions Sulzer as 'the chief of the subscribers' to the creation of the commemorative medal. It appears Sulzer was introduced to Frederick by Mitchell to further this purpose. See *Oevures*, Marquis d'Argens to Frederick, Vol. 19, pp. 245-246; *ibid.*, Frederick to Sulzer, June 1761, Vol. 17, p. 397.

[30] Johan van der Zande, 'Johann Georg Sulzer's *Allgemeine Theorie der Schönen Künste*, in Carsten Zelle, ed, *Das Achtzehnte Jahrhundert. Zeitschrift der Deutschen Gesellschaft für die Erforschung des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts: Enzyklopädien, Lexika und Wörterbucher im 18. Jahrhundert* (Wolfenbüttel, 1998), p. 90.

[31] Hufbauer, *German chemical community*, p. 14.

[32] Some of Sulzer's natural philosophy was also of a moral nature and was presented as such by he and Mitchell's mutual friend Christian Fürchtegott Gellert. See Walter Schatzberg, *Scientific themes in the popular literature and the poetry of the German enlightenment, 1720-1760* (Bern, 1973), p. 299.

[33] Cited in Manfred Kuehn, *Kant: A biography* (Cambridge, 2002), p. 408. Frederick's reply was 'my dear Sulzer, you do not sufficiently know this evil race to which we belong'.

in Prussia by 1761. Mitchell had befriended a number of the most eminent members of the Prussian scientific community, including Euler, Maupertuis, Formey, C. E. Gellert, and Sulzer himself, to name a few. Through his friendship with Patrick Murdoch, Sulzer also realised the potential for access to the latest information and scientific implements that could come from Mitchell. There were also precedents for his successful facilitation of learned material and research.

In the mid-1730s, at the commencement of his most fashionable London years, Mitchell had made clear his interests in sociability, science, and his potential role as an intermediary in its dissemination. He wrote to his close friend Francesco Algarotti, after the former had left London for Paris.[34] Algarotti, a learned Venetian whose academic-cultural itinerant lifestyle left a string of lovers from Lord Hervey and Mary Wortley Montagu in London to Frederick the Great in Prussia, had stayed with Mitchell in London. Mitchell reported reading 'with delight' Algarotti's dialogue on lights and colours, and added that it was approved by all with knowledge of it. Mitchell lamented the lack of an English translation, 'to show that even philosophy is capable of elegant and agreeable dress, for it hath been the fault of most writers in this country to endeavour to instruct without studying to please'. Some of the crossed out sections of this draft point to Mitchell's broader consciousness of the market (or so he saw it) for philosophico-scientific works. After faulting British writers, he crossed out an observation that their poor writing 'means those amusements have been confined to one sex'. Mitchell believed that someone had re-printed Algarotti's work without permission, and in order to ensure only authentic copies came to important readers, Algarotti asked Mitchell to give copies of his book to Folkes and the Royal Society, saying 'I hope you will have made this mark if not of my genius at least of my friendship and my memory'. Further, he told Mitchell he was going to Paris to liberate them from ignorance and inquisition, and regretted leaving Mitchell and the 'bosom of reason and philosophy'.[35] Mitchell reported to Algarotti that he had given copies to Thomson, Hervey, and others, knowing that Algarotti would wish eminent people to read his work. Algarotti kept in touch with Mitchell throughout his travels to St Petersburg and across Europe (where he met Frederick in Prussia), and reported that he was returning to London soon, when he hoped to 'embrace you in 4 or 5 days'.[36]

Algarotti was an early populariser of Newtonianism and his dialogue on light and colour to which Mitchell refers seems to be his *Newtonianism for the Ladies*.[37] It is clear that Mitchell and others had the opportunity to read this work prior to its publication in 1737. The book owed much to the instructional

[34] This letter cited throughout this paragraph. Andrew Mitchell to Francesco Algarotti, undated (1736), BL Add MS 58293, f. 21.
[35] Francesco Algarotti to Mitchell, undated, BL Add MS 58289, f. 17.
[36] Franceso Algarotti to Mitchell, 19 (August?) 1739, BL Add MS 58289, f. 45; Robert Halsband, *Lord Hervey: Eighteenth-century courtier* (New York and Oxford, 1974), p. 251. Some of Algarotti's itinerary is outlined in Cheryl Smeall, 'How to become a renowned writer: Francesco Algarotti (1712-1764) and the uses of networking in eighteenth-century Europe', PhD. Diss., McGill University, 2010.
[37] Francesco Algarotti, *Il Newtonianismo per la dame ovvero Dialoghi sopra la luce e i colori* (Napoli, 1737).

dialogues made popular by Fontenelle, which brought a sociable gentility to the dissemination of science.[38] In his association with Algarotti and this work, and given his comments on the exclusion of women, it is clear that Mitchell also subscribed to these views. Massimo Mazzotti sees Algarotti's ideas, and the publication of the *Newtonianism*, as a radical, subversive, anti-religious work,[39] and his work definitely delivered the 'new Mode of cultivating the Mind' that Algarotti aimed for.[40]

In 1740, Mitchell had been the intermediary in having Colin Maclaurin's paper on calculating the measurements of spheroids presented to the Royal Society, and even communicated the paper himself.[41] Sulzer may not have been aware of Mitchell's ability to procure scientific implements, as he did in sending a 'digester' purchased from Francis Hauksbee the Younger to the Philosophical Society of Edinburgh in 1743.[42] But in Murdoch, Mitchell had a reliable source for procuring implements in Britain, and Sulzer recognised Mitchell's importance in this regard as the intermediary.

There is no doubt also that Sulzer recognised Mitchell's influence with both Frederick and his numerous, influential friends back in Britain (not to mention Algarotti as a shining example of Mitchell's friendships). Dieudonné Thiébault, a long-time member of Frederick's court, had praised, first and foremost, Mitchell's virtue, when writing of the Mitchell's arrival in Berlin; the example of which he said was that Mitchell had been 'united by the strictest bonds of friendship with the author of *L'Esprit des lois*'.[43] Knowledge of Mitchell's membership of the Royal Society would also certainly have preceded him among the members of the Berlin scientific and learned community. Murdoch was a British source for Berlin-based Sulzer, between whom Mitchell acted as intermediary. Murdoch carried out a large number of commissions for Sulzer and other eminent learned men in Berlin, whom he knew from his short stay as Mitchell's secretary in 1756. Murdoch's letters to Mitchell are frequently ended with compliments to his 'German friends', first among which was Sulzer but who also included Euler, Cori (the King's concert master), the Abbé Jerusalem (Rector at the College of Brunswick and later author of a defence of German literature in response to Frederick),[44] and Anthony Achard and his brother François, members of the legal

---

[38] Geoffrey V. Sutton, *Science for a polite society: Gender, culture, and the demonstration of Enlightenment* (Boulder and Oxford, 1995), p. 257.
[39] Massimo Mazzotti, 'Newton for ladies: gentility, gender and radical culture', *British Journal for the History of Science*, 37 (2004), pp. 119-146.
[40] Sarah Hutton, 'Science for ladies? Elizabeth Carter's translation of Algarotti and 'popular' Newtonianism in the eighteenth century', in Elizabethanne Boran and Mordechai Feingold, eds, *Reading Newton in early modern Europe* (Leiden and Boston, 2017), p. 106.
[41] Colin Maclaurin, 'A rule for finding the meridional parts to any spheroid, with the same exactness as in a sphere, by Colin Mac Laurin, F. R. S. communicated by Andrew Mitchel, Esq; F. R. S', *Philosophical Transactions*, 41 (1740), pp. 808-809.
[42] Maclaurin indicated in his letter on this subject that Mitchell could see Hauksbee at the Royal Society or at some other place, to enquire into procuring the 'digester' directly. See Maclaurin to Mitchell, 3 December 1743, BL Add. MS 6861, f. 66. The digester was used to seal substances in a copper tank to facilitate faster and more complete breakdown. See *The London Encyclopaedia, or Universal Dictionary of Science, Art, Literature, and Practical Mechanics*, Vol. 7 (London, 1829), p. 250.
[43] Thiébault, *Original anecdotes*, Vol. 2, p. 2; Bisset, *Memoirs*, p. 140. Thiébault referred of course to Mitchell's intimate friendship with Montesquieu, the fact of which must have preceded him to Berlin.
[44] See *The Gentleman's Magazine and Historical Chronicle*, Vol. 52 (London, 1782), p. 478; *The Monthly Repository and Review of Theology and General Literature*, Vol. 3 (London, 1829), p. 67. Boswell, in his trip to Berlin, had spent time

and religious community in Berlin and both members of the Berlin Academy. One of the commissions Murdoch carried out for Sulzer was to send a packet from Robert Smith, mathematician, Plumian Professor of Astronomy and Elemental Philosophy at Cambridge (resigned 1760) and a friend to both Mitchell and Murdoch.[45] Murdoch told Mitchell that the latter was remembered 'with great pleasure and affection' by Smith.[46] Indeed Murdoch cultivated the friendship of Smith's successor as Plumian Professor, Antony Sheperd.[47] It was Mitchell's ability to render services to Sulzer, Murdoch, and others that most bolstered his learned reputation.

No better example of this in relation to Sulzer can be found than when Mitchell facilitated for Sulzer the purchase of the most sought-after scientific instruments of the day, an achromatic-lens telescope designed by John Dollond in 1758.[48] The achromatic refracting telescope was a great leap forward in lens technology and its application, and was closely shrouded in secrecy as to its design and manufacture by Dollond and his son, Peter.[49] There were many competing claims to invention of the achromatic lens, which corrected problems with focus and 'chromatic aberration', or the different focal points of colours through the lenses. Indeed, the patent case fought by the Dollonds against their many enemies was one of the biggest, and most expensive of the century.[50] By combining different curvatures of crown glass and flint glass, Dollond harnessed the differing indices of refraction and the different dispersive qualities of each to achieve a near seamless vision through the telescope.[51] The problem had been most importantly addressed by Newton, who claimed that perfect refracting lenses such as those in the achromatic telescope could not be achieved. In the 1740s, Euler had waded into the issue, and suggested that the human eye itself was the

with Jerusalem and was engaged by his religious philosophy. See Marlies K. Danziger, 'Boswell's travels through the German, Swiss, and French Enlightenment', in Irma S. Lustig, ed, *Boswell: Citizen of the world, man of letters* (Lexington, 1995), pp. 13-36.

[45] Murdoch to Mitchell, 1 April 1757, BL Add MS 6840, f. 23. Sulzer had a long-standing interest in astronomy and natural history, something noted in a poem praising him by his friend Samuel Gotthold Lange. See Schatzberg, *Scientific themes*, p. 214.

[46] Murdoch to Mitchell, 30 April 1757, BL Add MS 6840, f. 25.

[47] Patrick Murdoch to Andrew Mitchell, 1 April 1757, BL Add MS 6840, f. 23; Patrick Murdoch to Andrew Mitchell, 12 July 1766, BL Add MS 6840, f. 65.

[48] Noted at the outset of this section. A wide ranging survey of the history of optical instruments, with a lengthy bibliography, can be found in G. L'E. Turner, 'The history of optical instruments: A brief survey of sources and modern studies', *History of Science*, 8 (1969), pp. 53-93. A more focused look at the sources and studies on astronomical instruments can be found in Francis Maddison, 'Early astronomical and mathematical instruments: A brief survey of sources and modern studies', *History of Science*, 2 (1963), pp. 17-50. Dollond's instruments continued to be popular and crucial to scientific discovery well into the nineteenth century. See Robert W. Smith, 'The Cambridge network in action: The discovery of Neptune', *Isis*, 80 (1989), p. 407.

[49] Gerard L'E Turner, *Scientific instruments 1500-1900: An introduction* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1998), p. 92.

[50] Some of these, such as the claims of Frances Watkins, Chester Moor Hall, and Samuel Klingenstierna, are closely followed in Brian Gee, *Francis Watkins and the Dollond telescope patent controversy*, ed. Anita McConnell and A. D. Morrison-Low (London and New York, 2014).

[51] Gerard L'E Turner, *Nineteenth-century scientific instruments* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1983), p. 163. Dollond and son's methodology for the development of the new lenses included designing vitrometers to ascertain the refractive and dispersive powers of each type of glass, making their authentic productions all the more scientifically rigorous. See Richard Sorrenson, 'George Graham, visible technician', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, 32 (1999), p. 217.

perfect refracting lens (though the brain worked to correct the eye's aberration),[52] effectively suggesting the eye be replicated by adding water between two lenses.[53] Thus, knowledge of the problems Dollond eventually solved had spread to Prussia by the 1740s and opened a line of communication between the Royal Society and its Prussian counterpart by 1752.[54] The spread of debate over this issue evidently was of great importance to Sulzer in order to be fully informed about this emerging scientific, aesthetic issue, which had now spread to France and Russia.[55] It was important that Sulzer obtain an authentic and original Dollond telescope, and perhaps he obtained one of the last overseen by John Dollond himself prior to his death in December 1761. The importance of Dollond's discoveries in continential Europe, particularly in Prussia given Euler's involvement, was also demonstrated later when Johann Bernoulli III, on his trip to the scientific centres of Europe, singled out for attention the Dollond workshop (then run by John's son Peter) on his arrival in London.[56] The importance of an authentic example also lay in the prolific copies being made by instrument makers and opticians around London – and indeed Europe – in spite of Dollond's patent of 1758.[57]

Dollond's paper of 1758, in which he claimed to have corrected Newton's theory on the lens problem and made a telescope to prove it, 'caused a sensation throughout the European optical community', and Dollond was soon after awarded the Society's highest honour, the Copley Medal. It was framed as a statement of the Society's impartiality and pursuit of universal truth.[58] Sulzer was elated that Mitchell had managed to deliver one of Dollond's telescopes into his hands in October 1761.[59] He gushed:

---

[52] Richard Sorrenson, 'Dollond & son's pursuit of achromaticity, 1758-1789', *History of Science*, 39 (2001), pp. 31-58. Some half-century earlier, the Savilian professor of astronomy at Oxford, David Gregory, had proposed such a way of addressing the goal of overcoming the imperfection of lenses by replicating the human eye. See David Gregory, *Elements of catoptrics and dioptrics*, trans. William Browne, 2nd ed. (London, 1735), pp. 110-111.

[53] Gloria Clifton, 'Dollond family', *ODNB*, at https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/49855, accessed 10 January 2018. Euler's contributions to this issue are outlined in more detail in Emil A. Fellmann, 'Leonhard Eulers stellung in der Geschichte der Optik' in E. A. Fellmann, ed, *Leonhard Euler 1707-1783. Beiträge zu Leben und Werk* (Basel, 1983), pp. 303-330.

[54] James Short, 'Letter relating to a theorem of Mr. Euler, of the Royal Academy of sciences at Berlin, and F. R. S. for correcting the aberrations in the object-glasses of refracting telescopes', *Philosophical Transactions*, 48 (1753), pp. 287-296. Short was one of Dollond's champions in this regard, despite his involvement in rival reflecting telescopes. See G. L'E. Turner, 'James Short, F. R. S., and his contribution to the construction of reflecting telescopes', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, 24 (1969), p. 92.

[55] Henry C. King, 'The invention and early development of the achromatic telescope', *Popular Astronomy*, 56 (1948), p. 77.

[56] Johann Bernoulli, 'Fifth letter', *Lettres astronomiques où l'on donne une idée de l'état actuel de l'astronomie pratique dans plusiers villes de l'europe* (Berlin, 1771), pp. 65-69; D. W. Dewhirst, 'Observatories and instrument makers in the eighteenth century', in Arthur Beer, ed, *Vistas in astronomy*, Vol. 1 (Oxford, London, New York and Paris, 1955), pp. 142-143.

[57] John R. Millburn, *Benjamin Martin: Author, instrument-maker, and 'country showman'* (Leyden, 1976), p. 127.

[58] Sorrenson, 'Dollond and son's pursuit of achromaticity', p. 35.

[59] Sulzer claims to have had the telescope only eight days at the time of writing, meaning he received the telescope around 23 October 1761. BL Add MS 6858, f. 145.

> It has been a long time since I have had such pleasure, as that which Your Excellency has just made me by Dollon's telescope. This piece, very perfect in itself, has received yet another new and invaluable price coming to me by the hands of Your Excellency.[60]

After a long discussion of the debate, and investigation of these lens problems which Dollond has corrected, Sulzer reinforces his acknowledgement of Mitchell's scientific knowledge and frames his information as merely a discussion between two equally enthusiastic scholars:

> But all this is too well known to Y[our] Ex[cellency] for me to stop there, it is here to give him an idea of Mr. Dollon's discovery, which serves to correct these two defects.[61]

Sulzer's letter also makes passing reference to perhaps one of the most important emerging concerns in the contemporary scientific and learned community at this time, particularly in Prussia: the idea of the utility of discoveries to the state and its people.[62] He also reminds Mitchell what a great service the latter has done. Sulzer firstly begs Mitchell's pardon for his energetic fervour in discussing this new telescope, then says that for learned men, Dollond's discovery is:

> … more than the conquest of a province [, it] has no worth to politicians [but] we like to talk about it as an important thing. I am deeply charmed if Y[our] Ex[cellency] wishes to draw the conclusion that I have a very great obligation to have procured for me such an interesting instrument.[63]

Sulzer was indeed so enamoured of Dollond's telescope, and Mitchell's ability to procure these instruments for him, that he continued to ask favours of the British envoy for more of Dollond's authentic pieces, now overseen by John Dollond's son Peter. Sometime prior to 14 June 1766 Sulzer ordered a number of new

---

[60] Sulzer to Mitchell, 31 October 1761, BL Add MS 6858, f. 144. Il y a longtems que je n'ai eu de plaisir aussi sensible que celui que Votre Excellence vient de me faire par le telescope de Dollon. Cette pièce trés parfaite en elle même a reiu encore un prix nouveau et inéstimable venant à moi par les mains de Votre Excellence.
[61] *Ibid.*, f. 144v. Mais tout cela est trop connu à V. Ex. pour que je m'y arrête, il s'aqil ici de Lui donner une ideé de la decouver de Mr Dollon, qui aboutil à corriger ces double defaut.
[62] This was happening around Europe, not only in Prussia. See Roche, *France in the Enlightenment*, pp. 516-517.
[63] *Ibid.*, ff. 145^{r-v}. Mais ... autres gens de lettres une decouverte comme celle de Mr Dollon ... plus que la conquète d'une province ne vaut aux politiques et nous aimons à en parler comme des choses importantes. Je serré charmé si V. Ex. voulût en tirer la conclusion, que je Lui ai une trés grande obligation de m'avoir procuré un instrument aussi interessant.

lenses and instruments from Dollond through Mitchell, who utilised his contact Patrick Murdoch in London to post them to Berlin. Some £49.10.6 worth of Dollond's manufactures was ordered through Mitchell, and the money was also moved through Mitchell's banker Drummond,[64] which finally arrived around three months later.[65] However, it was not until early the following year that Murdoch was able to prompt Dollond to send the '6 pocket perspectives for M. Sulzer, at Mr. Pollock's, who has undertaken to have them forwarded to Berlin'.[66] Sulzer thus saw Mitchell as a crucial intermediary in his search for the newest and most sought-after scientific and learned instruments and information. Broadly defined, the latest fields of research also included medicine and anatomy. In Chapter 2 I elaborated on Mitchell's friendship with Pringle, and the benefits this had for Mitchell's politics, and Pringle's career and medical research. Mitchell had a continued interest in science, medicine and anatomy in Prussia.

Mitchell's ongoing friendship with both the widows of Maupertuis and Lieberkühn in Berlin shows his attentiveness to their situation. It was in this latter situation that Mitchell showed himself again as a singular intermediary option for Sulzer. The eminent anatomist Johann Nathanael Lieberkühn had died in 1756, and while his son Christian Gottlieb Lieberkühn presumably inherited his father's anatomical collections, his own death in 1761 left the widow Lieberkühn needing to raise money.[67] Lieberkühn senior's death on 7 October 1756 means this is almost certainly the younger Lieberkühn that Patrick Murdoch sends compliments to in his later letters to Mitchell.[68] He may have been already familiar to Murdoch and Mitchell, having himself been made a Fellow of the Royal Society of London when he visited the city in 1740.[69] The importance of this intersection of people is that Andrew Mitchell was asked by Sulzer, once more, to act as intermediary, this time in a potential transaction with greater ramifications for learning in Prussia and Britain, and greater financial burden involved.

Indeed, Sulzer begins his approach to Mitchell, in a letter of 17 October 1761, by acknowledging Mitchell's intimate regard for both the late Lieberkühn and his work. He takes the liberty of addressing

---

[64] Patrick Murdoch to Mitchell, 14 June 1766, BL Add MS 6840, f. 64; Murdoch to Mitchell, 12 July 1766, BL Add MS 6840, f. 65; Murdoch to Mitchell, 27 August 1766, BL Add MS 6840, f. 67.
[65] Murdoch to Mitchell, 22 September 1766, BL Add MS 6840, f. 69. It seems that Sulzer may have ordered a number of Dollond telescopes in this order, as the expense of the order makes sense only if Sulzer ordered around five Dollond telescopes. As the pocket perspectives he ordered were only in the region of £1.14s each, the remainder must have been made up of a large telescope order. The sale of the earl of Bute's Dollond telescopes in 1793 shows that five telescopes were bought for £42 in total, roughly equating to the order Sulzer made in 1766. See G. L'E Turner, 'The auction sales of the earl of Bute's instruments, 1793', *Annals of Science*, 23 (1967), pp. 213-242, particularly pp. 223, 229.
[66] Murdoch to Mitchell, 19 February 1767, BL Add MS 6840, f. 73. The pocket perspectives were not exactly pocket by modern standards – some labelled 'pocket' measured up to twelves inches in length, such as one (of several Dollond instruments) owned by the earl of Bute. See Turner, 'Auction sales', p. 229.
[67] Darrell M. Berg notes the relation of Johann Nathanael and Christian Gottlieb. See Berg, *The correspondence of Christian Gottfried Krause*, p. 273, though there is no mention of a relation in Johann Nathanael's listing in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*. See August Hirsch, 'Lieberkühn, Johann Nathanael', in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, 18 (1883), pp. 576-577, at https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd104196645.html#adbcontent, accessed 11 January 2018.
[68] Two letters from Murdoch to Mitchell give compliments, one to Lieberkühn's family (5 October 1761, BL Add MS 6840, f. 48^{v}), and another to 'Mrs Lieberkühn' (6 May 1763, BL Add MS 6840, f. 54).
[69] RS, EC/1740/20, nominated 22 May 1740, elected 18 December 1740.

Mitchell as the most appropriate person to 'render a service to the widow and to the memory of the deceased'.[70] Sulzer further explains that when the widow Lieberkühn raised the idea of selling her late husband's vast anatomical collection he 'advised her to have recourse to the goodness of Your Excellency in order to get some clarity'.[71] The collection also included lenses for which Lieberkühn became quite known, and which may have also excited both Mitchell and Sulzer's interest in the collection.[72] The recent development of new telescopic and microscope technology, in Sulzer's mind, might have made the sale of these materials through Mitchell all the more pertinent, given that Sulzer's aim was for Mitchell to act as intermediary in the sale of the collection to the Royal Society in London, currently undergoing its own convulsions over the contested Dollond lens patents (see above). Moreover, Lieberkühn built his own observational instruments, including the microscopes, heightening the appeal of the potential sale.[73]

In actual fact, Sulzer did not limit the possibility of sale to the Royal Society alone, but also extended the possibility to any individual wealthy enough to spend the thousand pounds Mrs Lieberkühn was asking. 'Doubtless in England rather than elsewhere there are to be found individuals who are curious enough to wish to possess such beautiful things, and at the same time rich enough to procure them', Sulzer told Mitchell. To contact these men and precipitate this expensive and grand sale, Sulzer knew Mitchell to be his man:

> I am convinced that Y[our] Ex[cellency] is sufficiently inclined to reflect on the means of procuring for his country a treasure so rare. … nothing has ever been seen so perfect as this genius, and it is probable that we shall not see it in the future, in view of the superior talents of the deceased for anatomy and mechanics.[74]

It is unclear whom Mitchell may have contacted about the sale, if at all. No letters by Mitchell have been found soliciting the sale of Lieberkühn's anatomical collection, and Sulzer does not raise the issue any more

---

[70] Johann Georg Sulzer to Andrew Mitchell, 17 October 1761, BL Add MS 6858, f. 139. 'rendre un service à la veuve et à la memoire même du defunt'.
[71] *Ibid.* '… je lui conseillois de recourir à la bonté de Votre Excellence pour en avoir quelque ectaircissement'.
[72] Sulzer enclosed two catalogues of the collection, printed in Latin, in the letter of 17 October 1761, but which does not have its own folio number.
[73] Hirsch, 'Lieberkühn, Johann Nathanael'. In his defence of his theories relating to lenses and refraction in letters to Britain concerning Dollond, Euler had reminded the Royal Society that 'our eminent Lieberkühn is applying himself to the working of glasses of which the curvature of the surfaces decreases from the middle towards the edge, and he foresees great improvements'. Cf. King, 'Achromatic telescope', p. 77.

[74] Sulzer to Mitchell, 17 October 1761, BL Add MS 6858, f. 139^{r-v}. The individuals in England: 'on trouveroit sans doute en Angleterre plutôt qu'ailleurs des particuliers assez curieux pour souhaiter de posseder de si belles choses et en même tems assez riches pour se les procurer'. For his conviction that Mitchell was the man: 'Je suis persuade que V. Ex. est assez porter d'Elle même à reflechir sur les moyens de procurer à sa patrie un trésor si rare. … n' a jamais rien vû de si parfait dans ce genie et il est probable [?] qu'on n' en verra pas à l'avenir, vû les talens superiors du defunt pour l'anatomie et la mecanique'.

in any known letters. Further work on Sulzer's letters, scattered across Germany, may reveal the fate of this exchange. While Lierbkühn's writings were later published in London in 1782, the collection was advertised to the public in the *Année Litteraire* of 1764, and proclaimed as the work of the greatest anatomist since Frederik Ruysch, the renowned seventeenth-century Dutchman.[75] As a sign of the scientific potency and status of the collection, the collection was dispersed in several sales involving 'astronomical' sums, where they were purchased by Catherine the Great, and the collector Gottfried Christoph Beireis, among others.[76]

iv. Intersections of politics and science in Mitchell's diplomacy

The potential sale, and the choice of Mitchell as intermediary by Sulzer, attributes further importance to Mitchell as the British intermediary of choice for learned men in Berlin (for certainly at times others acted in this way in the Republic of Letters). It reinforces some of the main ideas in this thesis about Mitchell's combination of learned pursuits, with politics and diplomacy. Undoubtedly politics was never far from Mitchell in Berlin and in Britain. His letters to Berlin during his stay in London from 1764-65 show him to be ever-conscious of his duty to politics in both places. Murdoch's letters had also informed Mitchell about politics in the context of science, and science for its own sake. For example, Murdoch frequently informed Mitchell about the furore over the potential loss of navigational technology occasioned by the British Parliament's tardiness in acting on the discoveries of John Harrison. Mitchell felt very acutely the missteps made by his own government and this was heightened by Frederick's observations on that subject.

Mitchell's requests for convalescent leave were finally approved in 1764 and he removed to Britain for almost two years. When he left Berlin for London in September 1764 Mitchell travelled through Spa with Sulzer, Henry Fuseli, and Carl Friedrich Ernst von Cocceji.[77] At Spa he probably also associated with other Britons there at the time, including his correspondent William Rouet (see Chapter 4), Sir Harry Erskine and his wife, Lady Mary Lowther, Walter Scott of Harden and his wife, Lord Shelburne, and William, fourth Duke of Devonshire.[78] He was back in London on the 14th December and had a long audience with the King, and requested immediately that Burnet send him a number of books from his Berlin library. Shortly before, he had insisted that Burnet send him any pieces good or bad printed in Prussia and said to be by Frederick – 'take good and bad', Mitchell told him, 'but endeavour to be sure of their

[75] Hugh James Rose, *A New General Dictionary*, 12 vols., Vol. 9 (London, 1853), p. 269; 'Cabinet Anatomique ou Collection des Préparations Anatomiques de feu M. Lieberkün, Médicin Prussien', *L'Année Littéraire*, Vols. 1-2, Vol. 2 (Amsterdam, 1764), pp. 136-140, on p. 138.
[76] Barbara Orland, 'Repositories and treasure troves of knowledge', *Uni Nova: Research Magazine of the University of Basel*, 122 (2013), pp. 15-16. Catherine paid 7000 rubles for a substantial part of the collection.
[77] It seems that, on his return to Prussia from London in 1766, Mitchell dined with Cocceji once more. See *Journals of the Hon. William Hervey, in North America and Europe, from 1755 to 1814* (Bury St. Edmunds, 1906), p. 191.
[78] William Rouet to Baron Mure, 9 October 1764, in *Selections from the family papers preserved at Caldwell*, Part II, Vol. 1, p. 270.

authenticity, and when that is doubted put a mark upon the paper'.[79] In London, he was evidently pressed for more on Frederick, and requested that Burnet also forward Mitchell's copies of '*Histoire de la maison de Brandenburg* in quarto' and, from Mitchell's study, '*Oeuvres de Philosophe de Sans Souci* of the same size'.[80] It is unclear whether this was at the request of George III, or was requested by Mitchell for his friends. Certainly George III held a great antipathy toward Frederick, and had harboured this antipathy for some years. In 1762 he had called Frederick 'that too ambitious Monarch', and 'the proud, overbearing Prince'.[81] George III must have been only too glad that Mitchell left Berlin, for having no accredited representative there (except Burnet) would have suited George's attitude to Prussia. In letters to Bute through 1762 and 1763, he repeatedly spoke ill of Frederick.

Since 1762 and the affair of the Galitzin letter (see Chapter 7), George III had been keen to recall Mitchell. The letter exposed (in a misquoted fashion) British thoughts on a peace settlement that might be detrimental to Prussia. When Frederick wrote a memorial addressing the accusations, George wrote to Bute. The memorial, George believed, was 'by far the most impertinent, and illusory paper, that was ever sent to any Court, and I should imagine will require a very strong answer at least, and perhaps a recall of our Minister'.[82] The rumours of British talks with Austria was one of the first items to complicate Anglo-British relations in the wake of the ending of the Prussian subsidy. George approved a strongly worded letter to be sent to Mitchell in Prussia, addressing Frederick's complaints about British negotiations.[83] 'Nothing can be more proper than the dispatch to Mr Mitchell, anything less strong would have been too weak', George told Bute. He addressed counter-rumours of Frederick negotiating with France. 'What measures have we to keep with one who is ready to leave us the first opportunity, yet thinks he has reason to complain if we don't even show him the papers that pass between us and any Court; I owne the getting rid of him is what I most ardently wish'.[84] Other letters in this vein will be addressed in Chapter 7. Mitchell, however, wrote to Prussia on various matters not always related to politics.

Mitchell's letters to Burnet frequently discuss both politics and science. In March 1765 Mitchell wrote to Burnet of the Stamp Act, saying 'the most material thing we have had in [parliament] has been laying the Stamp Duty upon our Colonies, a measure which tho' right will occasion future trouble',[85] and at the same time reported with pleasure that parliament had finally agreed to gift Euler £300 for 'theorems invented by him upon which Meyers Lunar tables are calculated'.[86] In 1714 the British parliament had put

[79] Mitchell to Burnet, 28 November 1764, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Bundle 82.
[80] Mitchell to Burnet, 18 December 1764, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Bundle 82.
[81] George III to Bute, 5 February 1762, in Romney Sedgwick, ed, *Letters from George III to Lord Bute 1756-1766* (London, 1939), p. 81.
[82] George III to Bute, 22 October 1762, in *Ibid.*, p. 149.
[83] This is discussed further in Chapter 7, Part iii.
[84] George III to Bute, 29 April 1762, in Sedgwick, ed, *Letters from George III*, p. 95
[85] Mitchell to Burnet, 8 March 1765, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Bundle 82.
[86] Mitchell to Burnet, 29 March 1765, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Bundle 82. Tobias Mayer owed much to Euler for providing the theoretical basis for his own research that led to his breakthrough work on lunar cycles, and later, which contributed to greater work on longitude in Britain. See Eric Gray Forbes, 'The life and work of Tobias

up a £20,000 reward for discoveries leading to the development of a method for determining longitude at sea, and Tobias Mayer's work in the middle of the century, which was eventually tested and proved correct, was not immediately rewarded by the British parliament. Mayer himself hoped for half of this money, and in the end, the £3,000 remitted to his family after his death was, in Mitchell's mind, long overdue.[87] 'This does honour to the Nation, and can not fail to please my friend Euler', he told Burnet, 'as it comes to him unsolicited and I dare say unexpected. My compliments to him [Euler], & let him know that in this affair Mr Murdoch's attention has been of service to him'.[88] In the same letter, a postscript by Mitchell also indicated a political controversy that he likewise followed with interest: the reward to John Harrison for 'the discovery of the longitude', a discovery related to the work of Mayer and Euler.

The complementarity between Prussia, German-speaking lands such as Hanover, and Britain was a nexus that intersected frequently in Mitchell's career and correspondence. As noted above, he was conscious of the views that Frederick held toward the often chaotic ministerial politics in Britain, and knew that Frederick was well-disposed to William Pitt, as was Mitchell himself. In 1759 Frederick had told Mitchell that, 'the future of England has long been in labour and has suffered greatly to produce Mr Pitt, but in the end she is giving birth to a man'.[89] Despite being back in Britain Mitchell was never entirely settled and perhaps knew that he would find himself back in Berlin at some point in the near future. With this in mind, he communicated to Burnet his observations on British parliamentary sessions (where he sat as an MP for Elgin Burghs at this time) which related to British foreign policy. The Stamp Act was a particular point of note for Mitchell. Letters of May, June and July 1765 informed Burnet of the ministerial negotiations, and speculation about the return of Pitt.[90] He was also quick to assure Burnet that the new ministry of July 1765 would be better disposed to Frederick than the last ministry.[91] Pitt's continued absence from parliament was an ongoing source of tension: 'Would to God he was in office', Mitchell told Burnet. When Pitt finally returned to argue for the repeal of the Stamp Act in Parliament in January 1766, Mitchell reported to Burnet that 'I mention this as the most important affair that has been before Parliament for these fifty years', and by the next month he confided to Burnet that he believed the repeal would be successful.[92] Some months later, Burnet speculated that the successful repeal, and the prospect of Pitt returning to administration after this political victory, would prompt Frederick to send a different Prussian

Mayer (1723-62)', *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society,* 8 (1967), pp. 227-251, the key Euler points on p. 237.

[87] Forbes, 'Tobias Mayer', pp. 239, 242.

[88] Mitchell to Burnet, 29 March 1765, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Bundle 82. Euler did not receive his money for a number of months, but Mitchell reported success on this front to Burnet on 1 November 1765, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Bundle 82.

[89] Mitchell to William Pitt, 22 October 1759, BL Add MS 58292, f. 96^{v}.

[90] Mitchell to Burnet, 24 May 1765, 21 June 1765, and 5 July 1765, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Bundle 82.

[91] Mitchell to Burnet, 12 July 1765, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Bundle 82.

[92] Mitchell to Burnet, 20 December 1765; 17 January 1766, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Bundle 82. Mitchell said that Pitt's 'imprudence' had 'raised a most terrible storm that had like to have overset every thing' in Parliament. See Mitchell to Burnet, 11 February 1766, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Bundle 82.

envoy to London than the one he had chosen, hinting at a warming of Frederick's disposition toward Britain.[93]

Little direct political consequence could be drawn from Frederick's attitude to Mitchell and Britain but that it remained as it was at the conclusion of the Seven Years' War – that is, respectful but cold due to Britain's withdrawal of the subsidy to Prussia. Burnet's letters to Mitchell contain no first-hand information from Frederick, and indeed the monarch seems to have held less diplomatic levees due to ill health. However, Burnet continued to provide constant and up-to-date information to Mitchell, particularly concerning Frederick's treatment of his favourites (or supposed favourites) and those important to his government, such as Prince Henry and Leonhard Euler. Intrigues between Frederick and Henry – referred to as Castor and Pollux for some years in diplomatic and private correspondence – were a constant theme of Burnet's letters.[94] In forwarding Euler's compliments to Mitchell, Burnet also thought it important to note the break between Euler and Frederick. 'That honest man', Burnet told Mitchell,

> has been so disgusted with certain intrigues and jealousies conceived against him by the other academicians, that he wrote to Castor complaining of their Behaviour towards him, and requesting Redress the Answer received not being satisfactory, he took the resolution to write to the Empress of Russia desiring to enter into Her Majesty's Service and to bring his whole Family along with him into Russia.[95]

When he returned to Berlin in 1766 Mitchell resumed some of the activities he had been engaged in prior to his departure in 1764. The less arduous duty was waiting on Frederick, who showed little attention to Mitchell or his relationship to Britain, preferring to focus on rebuilding his kingdom and his revenues.[96] The perhaps more enjoyable elements of his interests were maintained and renewed, and this was particularly so of his interests in learned sciences. Here, the bonds of friendship with Murdoch continued what was a long friendship, brought together and seemingly sustained through mutual interests in philosophy and science.

v. Mitchell, Murdoch, and science in 'the honour of the Nation'

[93] Burnet to Mitchell, 25 March 1766, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Bundle 57.
[94] See for example Burnet to Mitchell, 1 October 1765, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Bundle 57.
[95] Burnet to Mitchell, 4 March 1766, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Bundle 57.
[96] This is elaborated on in Chapter 7, and was also due in part to changes in Britain's relationship to Prussia and events at the concluding years of the Seven Years' War.

This thesis has thus far encountered Patrick Murdoch frequently in concern with Mitchell over politics and science. This section aims to bring greater clarity to this relationship, and to highlight some ways in which the two intersected through their friendship. Murdoch's primary profession was as a clergyman, where he benefited from patronage to secure good, but not highly-remunerated employment.[97] It did, however, afford him ample time for his scientific interests and correspondence. Murdoch perhaps also saw himself as something of an intermediary and, were it not for his poor financial circumstances, could perhaps have achieved more in the fields of science than his career in the clergy allowed.[98] Mitchell certainly seems to have recognised this in his friend and supported Murdoch's work and his livelihood to the best of his ability, not out of pity but out of obvious esteem for Murdoch's abilities.

Murdoch was one of that group of Mitchell's youth who formed a circle with Scots moving to London: James Thomson, George Armstrong, George Scott, and John Pringle to name some. Murdoch had early on committed himself to lifelong friendship with Mitchell. 'Our union of hearts', Murdoch had written, was balanced with 'a similitude of tempers … and an equal ambition of going hand in hand in the road of virtue and learning'.[99] Murdoch's contribution to the research of technical science and mathematics has perhaps been underappreciated. He wrote the life of Thomson after his death, but more importantly for his learned work, edited Maclaurin's *An Account of Sir Isaac Newton's Philosophical Discoveries, in Four Books* (1748), a third edition of Abraham de Moivre's *Doctrine of Chances* (1756), and was a highly able mathematician, astronomer, and scholar.[100] Murdoch wrote several essays that contributed to his translation of Anton Friedrich Büsching's *New System of Geography* (1762), commissioned by Millar, and for most of the 1760s was concerned with emerging considerations of the sun's parallax in the context of wider European study of these calculations.[101] This last field led to some of Murdoch's most technical publications and demonstrated his wide engagement with mathematics and astronomy, of which Mitchell would have been acutely aware. Murdoch utilised Mitchell as intermediary in transmitting to Euler and Sulzer the latest findings by James Short regarding the sun's parallax.[102] He also communicated to Mitchell the disagreement of his calculations with those of Matthew Stewart at Edinburgh and his corrections to Robert Symmer's theories about the refraction of light.[103]

---

[97] It has been speculated that Murdoch is the 'little, round, fat, oily man of God' in Thomson's *Castle of Indolence*. Further biographical information on Murdoch can be found in D. H. Maling, "A little, round, fat, oily man of God: Rev Patrick Murdoch and his contributions to eighteenth-century cartography and geography', *Cartographic Journal*, 20 (1983), pp. 110-118.

[98] One of the more notable clergymen who also pursued science to a renowned standard was Joseph Priestley.

[99] Murdoch to Mitchell, 28 August 1729, BL Add MS 58289, f. 1.

[100] For Murdoch's work with De Moivre, see David R. Bellhouse, *Abraham de Moivre: Setting the stage for classical probability and its applications* (Boca Raton, London and New York, 2011), pp. 213-215; David R. Bellhouse, 'Lord Stanhope's papers on the doctrine of chances', *Historia Mathematica*, 34 (2007), pp. 173-186. For more on his technical mathematics, see John P. Snyder, *Flattening the earth: Two thousand years of map projections* (Chicago and London, 1997), pp. 70-74, in which Murdoch is put on par with Euler.

[101] Murdoch to Mitchell, 28 January 1761, BL Add MS 6840, f. 44.

[102] Murdoch to Mitchell, 25 July 1763, BL Add MS 6840, f. 56^{v}.

[103] Murdoch to Mitchell, 25 July 1763, BL Add MS 6840, f. 56^{v}; Murdoch to Mitchell, 2 January 1764, BL Add MS 6840, f. 61; Matthew Stewart, *The distance of the sun from the earth determined by the theory of gravity* (Edinburgh, 1763); 'The

At first hand then, as part of the British scientific community, Murdoch – like many others – was concerned at the threat to scholarly rewards when the affair of John Harrison and his marine chronometers became the subject of a few letters to Andrew Mitchell.[104] Harrison's advances, which meant that it was possible to know the time at Greenwich during a voyage – a great advance in marine navigation – fed indirectly into the wider debate about science's position in relation to the state, something in which Mitchell was well-versed from his time in both Britain and Prussia. It became something of a diplomatic affair when the French became involved, and while the affair was more news to Mitchell rather than something requiring his direct interest, it is worth noting some details that were passed to Mitchell, and the emphasis placed on this news by Murdoch in his letters. He evidently believed Mitchell would benefit from hearing not only of the loss of initiative for Britain, but also the loss of some of the secret information to foreign powers.

By 1763 the long-running saga to find longitude at sea had come to a head, when John Harrison's marine chronometer was thought to be the best effort yet.[105] Murdoch reported that Harrison's son travelled to the West Indies in an effort to prove its worth and claim the premium reward offered by the government for its discovery.[106] Harrison's struggle over more than thirty-five years to have his designs recognised and the £20,000 prize awarded to him caused outcry over his ill-treatment and the potential threat of the loss of initiative for Britain that had been gained by Harrison's work. When Murdoch wrote to Mitchell in 1763 that Harrison's son was bound for the West Indies, this was a re-trial of three years earlier, when they had successfully trialled the chronometer only to have their results discounted by the tribunal assessing its work.[107] Murdoch told Mitchell that Harrison's friends thought it hard that his work was taken to be tested so rigorously

> after a satisfactory trial, in the terms of the Act of Parliament, had been made. They say, the Commissioners ought rather to have encouraged Harrison and his son, with as many good

account of Matthew Stewart, D. D. [Read by Mr John Playfair, April 3. 1786]', *Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, Vol. 1 (Edinburgh, 1788), Appendix, pp. 57-76.

[104] Murdoch had for some time been interested in his own calculations of sea navigation, and had at some point used Andrew Mitchell to show his sea charts to 'Dr Barker', being Robert Barker, a member of the Royal Society, physician, and early developer of a microscope. He had in a following letter also asked Mitchell to correct them. The first letter is Murdoch to Mitchell, 21 July 1739, BL Add MS 58289, f. 41; the second Patrick Murdoch to Andrew Mitchell, 26 July 1739, BL Add MS 58289, f. 42. See Marc J. Ratcliff, *The quest for the invisible: Microscopy in the Enlightenment* (London and New York, 2009), pp. 28-30.

[105] For a dedicated survey of Harrison and longitude, see Dava Sobel, *Longitude: The true story of a lone genius who solved the greatest scientific problem of his time* (London, 1995).

[106] Murdoch to Mitchell, 25 July 1763, BL Add MS 6840, f. 58. This was in accordance with the bounty on offer, of up to £20,000 depending on accuracy, for someone to successfully use their marine chronometer on a trial to the West Indies. See Andrew King, 'Harrison, John (bap. 1693, d. 1776)', *ODNB*, at https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/12438, accessed 16 January 2018.

[107] King, 'Harrison, John'.

> hands as could be found, to make more such instruments; that the art might be the sooner and the better propagated, and the public benefited.[108]

Worst of all, as Murdoch noted, the dithering of the board assessing the chronometer's merits was compounded when they had foolishly neglected to swear to secrecy the independent makers assigned to copy the clock. Thus Murdoch noted seeing an account of the affair in the journal *Connoissance des mouvemens celestes* (1767); the failure to keep Harrison's work secret, Murdoch noted gravely, meant that 'the consequence has been, that Mr Berthaud of Paris, having about a year ago come over on a sham errand, pick'd out of Mudge everything he knew; and now the French publish themselves Masters of the Whole Art'.[109] Clearly the French having obtained this knowledge, developed and discovered in Britain, was one of the most upsetting factors of the whole affair, more so than parliament's refusal to finally pay Harrison his claim. It confirmed the political nature of such a sensitive discovery only four years after the Seven Years' War, and the inherent political nature of important scientific experimentation that impinged on the world of foreign affairs and diplomacy. The affair dragged on, and while Murdoch reported the following month that there was a petition in Parliament for Harrison to receive his money, complaints continued to fly between Harrison and parliament, and the following January he told Mitchell that he would say 'not a word more of Harrison, the French will reap the honour and benefit of his labours; while we are dreaming about the moon'.[110]

Disputes such as the one endured by Harrison, and communicated by Murdoch to Mitchell, must be considered in the context of their occurrence. As noted above, the untimely delays in the confirmation of Harrison's discovery ultimately meant Britain lost the advantage of this accurate navigation at sea (though Harrison did receive his money). The preparation for the transits of Venus in 1761 and 1769, likewise, caused similar problems concerning funding and the ultimate aims of the exercise. When politicians became involved in negotiating the processes of scientific discovery, there was an uneven application of national sentiment (this is elaborated upon below). For example, Mitchell did not hesitate to send many of Dollond's latest telescopes to Sulzer, and there was nothing much said about what this meant for Prussian science in relation to British advances. Nor was anyone in British foreign affairs overly concerned when Dollond's work was so publicly tested and scrutinised. In Germany, at least retrospectively, there was argument that in fact German instrument makers and learned men had come up to par with their British counterparts in

---

[108] Murdoch to Mitchell, 1 January 1767, BL Add MS 6840, f. 71.
[109] *Ibid.* For Harrison and the French affair, see *Connoissance des temps pour l'année commune 1775* (Paris, 1774), p. 336. M. J. Brisson, *Dictionnaire Raisonné de Physique*, Vol. 4, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1798), p. 85. This volume also claims that Harrison published his knowledge of the chronometer in the *Connoissance* of 1765, see p. 222. Berthoud's instrument based on that of Harrison would eventually be tested by French expeditions for the 1769 transit of Venus. See Harry Woolf, *The transits of Venus: A study of eighteenth-century science* (Princeton, 1959), p. 158.
[110] Murdoch to Mitchell, 19 February 1767, BL Add MS 6840, f. 73; Murdoch to Mitchell, 21 April 1767, BL Add MS 6840, f. 75; Murdoch to Mitchell, 12 January 1768, BL Add MS 6840, f. 89.

some respects.[111] At their heart scientific processes, for British politicians, were partly about national honour, and an inherent belief that the Royal Society's work, and that of British scientists, was of benefit to the nation first, and the world thereafter (though the world was definitely thought to benefit from British research).[112]

When writing about chemistry, Jan Golinski has insisted that 'we need some knowledge of the language of eighteenth-century politics to understand the social relations of chemistry in Enlightenment Britain'.[113] The science of instrument making was just as political as its use. For example, when instrument-maker James Short died in 1768, he broke his tools and sold off the metal to prevent it being 'abused to the purposes of quackery' – and yet it did not prevent him sending his instruments to Russia.[114] The famous British scientist Humphry Davy, speaking to a friend about receiving an honour from Napoleon, said 'if the two countries or governments are at war, the men of science are not,- that would indeed be a *civil war* of the worst sort'. Davy added that, 'rather, we should through the instrumentality of men of science, soften the asperity of national war'.[115] Thus the language of national pride only inconsistently applied in the Republic of Letters, and despite inter-state antagonism, scientific exchange largely went on unhindered.[116] According to Gavin de Beer, it was Edward Jenner who concluded that 'the sciences are never at war', and that this maxim was part of science as an inviolable universal language.[117] French chemist Lavoisier embodied some of the contradictions that Jenner's statement creates, for despite his international scientific friendships, he was instrumental in the technical advances in gunpowder production, the result of which France sold to the American colonies.[118] These problems punctuate other areas of the sciences, and, for our purposes, astronomy and navigation. The transit of Venus of 1761, for which the Royal Society had made strong overtures for political funding, was part of the ongoing work being done on calculating the size of the universe. Murdoch's work on the solar parallax, as with that of Stewart, Edmund Halley, and others, demonstrated the ongoing central role of astronomy in scientific research. Preparations for the 1761 transit merely took this interest and translated it into a patriotic push for the best observations and the best interpretation of the results. To this end, the earl of Macclesfield, President of the Royal Society, had

---

111 Oliver Hochadel, *Öffentliche Wissenschaft: Elektrizität in der deutschen Aufklärung* (Göttingen, 2003), pp. 94-95.
112 John Gascoigne has noted the growing relationship of the Royal Society of London to the British government from the presidency of Joseph Banks. 'Scientific and geographical achievement', Gascoigne argues, 'being another arean in which the national rivalries of the age could find expression'. See John Gascoigne, *Science in the service of empire: Joseph Banks, the British state, and the uses of science in the age of revolution* (Cambridge, 1998), p. 24
113 Golinski, 'Utility and audience', p. 29.
114 Murdoch to Mitchell, 4 July 1768, BL Add MS 6840, f. 98.
115 John Davy, ed, *The Collected Works of Sir Humphry Davy*, Vol. 1 (London, 1839), p. 466.
116 See, for example, numerous letters from British learned men to Lavoisier after the French Revolution, and despite the increasing Franco-British tensions of 1792 in Douglas McKie, 'Antoine Laurent Lavoisier, F.R.S. 1743-1794', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, 7 (1949), pp. 1-41.
117 Sir Gavin de Beer, *The sciences were never at war* (London, Edinburgh, Paris, Melbourne, Johannesburg, Toronto and New York, 1960), p. xi.
118 Denis I. Duveen and Herbert S. Klickstein, 'Benjamin Franklin (1706-1790) and Antoine Laurent Lavoisier (1743-1794)', *Annals of Science*, 11 (1955), p. 273.

outlined to the Duke of Newcastle the importance of funding Britain's observations of the 1761 transit. He wrote a memorial to the Duke outlining the central reasons for funding:

> The Motives on which [the memorial] is founded are the Improvement of Astronomy and the Honour of this Nation. … And it might afford too just ground to Foreigners for reproaching this Nation in general (not inferior to any other in every branch of Learning and more especially in Astronome); if, while the French King is sending observers … and the Court of Russia are doing the same … not to mention the several Observers who are going to various Places, on the same errand from different parts of Europe; England should neglect to send Observers to such places … subject to the Crown of Great Britain. This is by foreign Countries in general expected of us; Because the use that may be derived from this Phaenomenon, will be proportionate to the numbers of distant places where … observations … shall be made of it.[119]

Macclesfield wrote that funding this endeavour, to send expeditions worldwide to observe the transit of 1761, would 'promote Science and … answer the general Expectation of the World'.[120] Perhaps he recognised that 'as the two great powers of eighteenth-century Europe, France and Britain's rivalry extended to their respective promotion of the sciences'.[121] Macclesfield's statements are an emphatic endorsement for British participation in the global accumulation of knowledge beyond national boundaries. He recognised that not only a patriotic duty, but also Britain's international reputation were on the line.[122] By sending out expeditions, Macclesfield argued, Britain was asserting its global reach, more so than France or Russia; by funding the Royal Society to deliver these observations, Macclesfield argued that Newcastle was directly endorsing British science as a global contributor.[123] In the context of the global Seven Years' War, such an achievement would no doubt be a blow to their enemies, but also do much to placate public sentiment about the work of government and ministry.

The transit of 1761 ran smoothly. The transit of 1769 thus allowed a greater scale of endeavour to reinforce the earlier achievements. It excited as much if not more warm competition between states in relation to science than the 1761 transit, while at the same time exhibiting a degree of international (read

---

[119] Earl of Macclesfield to the Duke of Newcastle, 5 July 1760, in Woolf, *The transits of Venus*, p. 83.
[120] *Ibid.*
[121] John Gascoigne's discussion on this theme in eighteenth-century politics and science is extremely useful. See John Gascoigne, *Encountering the Pacific in the age of the enlightenment* (Cambridge, 2014), chapter 8, and specifically pp. 271-279.
[122] Maurice Crosland, 'Relationships between the Royal Society and the Academie des Sciences in the late eighteenth century', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, 59 (2005), p. 30.
[123] Incidentally the French had the most recorded observers, followed by Sweden, with Britain in third. In Germany, Mayer (mentioned above in relation to lunar tables) took part. See Woolf, *The transits of Venus*, pp. 143.

non-French) cooperation between Britain, Denmark, Russia, and even the Elector Palatine and the Grand Duke of Tuscany.[124] The memorial delivered to George III by the Royal Society argued that, as other nations were preparing for the observation in earnest, Britain must act with great speed and diligence. It said, 'the British Nation has been justly celebrated in the learned World, for their Knowledge of Astronomy, to which they are Inferior to no nation upon Earth ancient or Modern; and it would cast Dishonour upon them should they neglect to have correct observations made of this Important Phaenomenon'.[125]

Murdoch, as a member of the committee charged with organising Britain's 1769 effort,[126] wrote to Mitchell that much work was being done; the famed navigator James Cook was setting out with a team for 'our new discovered Island in the S. Sea; and several other virtuosi along with them'.[127] He noted Joseph Banks and Daniel Solander, a Swede, who made their way to Australia and elsewhere with Cook.[128] The significance of Murdoch's letters here lay in his noting that the observers with Cook would use Bird's quadrant, an instrument directly related to Dollond's discoveries, and the work of Murdoch and others on parallaxes. Murdoch seems to have had intimate knowledge of the development of Bird's revolutionary quadrant which he communicated to Mitchell, Britain's scientific intermediary in Prussia. This significance is thus reinforced when we realise Mitchell facilitated the sending of copies of Bird's quadrant to Sulzer in Prussia the same year that Bird completed his revolutionary original. It was said that Bird would complete his quadrant, a commission 'from the academy', prior to Cook's departure, 'a year sooner than was allowed him', by the end of 1769. In the event, Bird completed his quadrant in time for the voyage's departure. It was instrumental in 'checking clock rate and measuring latitudes' on the voyage and in the transit of Venus in Tahiti, and Cook made a point of noting the quadrant made by Bird in his diary.[129] In December 1768, Murdoch reported to Mitchell that 'when you see M. Sulzer you will please tell him that I received his, and

---

[124] *Ibid.*, pp. 169-170. The latter two did not eventuate – the Elector Palatine's offer was ignored, and the Grand Duke's offer to send a Tuscan astronomer was declined. The man offered by the Elector Palatine eventually observed the transit from Russia at the invitation of Catherine the Great. See p. 180. James Short of the Royal Society sent many instruments to Russia for the purpose of observing the transit. See p. 180.

[125] Harold B. Carter, 'The Royal Society and the voyage of HMS 'Endeavour' 1768-71', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, 49 (1995), pp. 250-251.

[126] Woolf, *The transits of Venus*, p. 163.

[127] Murdoch to Mitchell, 29 July 1768, BL Add MS 6840, f. 100^{v}. Murdoch speaks of Tahiti, where Cook's team made the observations of the transit.

[128] I have attempted to discover any links between Mitchell and Johann Reinhold Forster, the naturalist on the second voyage of Captain Cook. Forster's son George, also present on that voyage, was in J. D. Michaelis's circle in Göttingen, which is distantly linked to Mitchell through John Pringle. However, Forster did not come into Pringle's orbit until after Mitchell's death in 1771. For Michaelis and Forster, see Gascoigne, *Encountering the Pacific*, p. 281. Forster landed in London in October 1766 from St Petersburg, and would not have met Mitchell in London, as the latter arrived back in Prussia in June that year. See Michael E. Hoare, *The tactless philosopher: Johann Reinhold Forster (1729-98)* (Melbourne, 1976), pp. 37, 69-70.

[129] Simon Schaffer, 'In transit: European cosmologies in the Pacific', in Kate Fullagar, ed, *The Atlantic world in the antipodes: Effects and transformations since the eighteenth century* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 2012), pp. 70-93; Wayne Orchiston, *Exploring the history of New Zealand astronomy: Trials, tribulations, telescopes and transits* (Dordrecht, 2016), pp. 130-131; Cook's journal, 2 May 1769, in W. J. L. Wharton, ed, *Captain Cook's Journal during his first voyage round the world made in H. M. bark 'Endeavour' 1768-71* (London, 1893), at http://gutenberg.net.au/ebooks/e00043.html, accessed 7 January 2018; J. C. Beaglehole, 'Cook the Navigator', *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 314 (1969), p. 34.

that Mr Bird will do his part within the time stipulated'.[130] It seems clear that there was no patriotic sentiment preventing Mitchell from working with Sulzer to provide the latest instruments to Prussian learned men. It was no doubt then part of his conception that diplomacy depended as much on providing services as a learned intermediary, as it did keeping Frederick amenable to British foreign policy. Woolf argues that the transit observations effectively advanced the cause of science everywhere, in relation to 'national wealth and attention', adding that the observations fuelled the intermingling of science and government that was well under way by this point. Moreover, Woolf notes, the endeavour brought together the community of scholars in a demonstration of the solidarity only scientific pursuits of this kind could produce.[131]

a. Mitchell and Dimsdale at the court of Prussia

Smallpox inoculator Thomas Dimsdale was invited to the court of Russia in 1762, and arrived there in 1768. He inoculated Russian ruler Catherine II, later 'the Great', and her son, Grand Duke Paul. The inoculation was a great success, but was also used as something of a political action. Mitchell, at this time settled back in Berlin, received news and updates on Dimsdale's success from the British Ambassador in St Petersburg, Charles Schaw Cathcart. This event and its subsequent political interpretation serves to show Mitchell's ongoing participation in international politics and science.

Informed as he naturally was about news from courts around Europe, Mitchell received word from Cathchart in February 1768 that Dimsdale would be travelling to St Petersburg to carry out the inoculations. Mitchell was, it seems, no stranger to knowledge and thinking on inoculation. He had been accompanied on his return to Prussia in 1766 by François Tronchin, 'son of the famous physitian of Geneva', the inoculation proponent Theodore Tronchin.[132] Before he had even left England, Mitchell and Tronchin were joined by William Hervey, later a renowned General.[133] Mitchell asked Burnet assist in finding lodgings

[130] Murdoch to Mitchell, 13 December 1768, BL Add MS 6840, f. 102.
[131] Woolf, *The transits of Venus*, p. 197.
[132] Mitchell to Burnet, 14 March 1766, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Bundle 82. A tantalising link to Tronchin in London in the 1730s, including possible meetings with Mary Wortley Montagu and Francesco Algarotti, has unfortunately not yielded any earlier links between Mitchell and Tronchin senior. See Isobel Grundy, 'Medical advance and female fame: Inoculation and its after-effects', *Érudit*, 13 (1994), pp. 13-42.
[133] 'I left town with an intention of laying at Dover at night, where I was to have met Sir Andrew Mitchel, whom I overtook at Canterbury stopt for want of horses. With Sir A. M. were Mr. Tronchin, son of the famous Physician of that name, and Lyons of the Regiment, a relation of Sir A's'. See *Journals of the Hon. William Hervey, in North America and Europe, from 1755 to 1814* (Bury St. Edmund's, 1906), p. 185. Also in this journal, Hervey itemises his daily activities. Whenever he is with Mitchell he is introduced to important people and generally dines with one or more of Mitchell's old acquaintances, probably from his time spent in Brussels in the early 1750s. These include, in order of mention, 'General Langley, an English Protestant in the Austrian service commanding in this district', Major Count Lutain, Nicolas de Nobili (banker and Counsellor of State), the Duke and Duchess d'Aremberg (with whom, in their carriage, Mitchell rode), General John Beckwith (who served with the Prussians), Baron Munchhausen, Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick, Madame Campke (Kamke, Governess of the Princess of Brunswick), Lord Marischal. In Brussels they also attended a dinner for Prince Charles of Lorraine. See pp. 186-195 passim.

for Tronchin as the latter intended to stay some time at Berlin.[134] Not long after, he informed Burnet that he would probably stop at Magdeburg on his way to Berlin, in order to meet Frederick.[135] Theodore Tronchin had been a close friend of Voltaire and this may play some part as to why, when they reached Magdeburg, his son François accompanied Mitchell in meeting Frederick.[136] However, the story of Tronchin is a deeper one. He accompanied his famous father to Britain, where François attended debates in parliament as preparation for a diplomatic career, and studied with Adam Smith in Glasgow. Suitably well connected, Tronchin returned to London, where he found himself in the midst of the Rousseau-Hume troubles when Rousseau was shocked to find François Tronchin, son of his enemy Theodore Tronchin, staying at the same house as Hume.[137] François wrote that 'my name is odious to [Rousseau] and he imagined that I came here to spy on his conduct, persecute him or even murder him, if I could'.[138] These connections with Hume and Smith were more than ample evidence of Tronchin's abilities. According to Rousseau, Theodore placed François with Mitchell, perhaps as a continuance of François' diplomatic training.[139] Mitchell was caught up in Rousseau's ire: the Frenchman believed that Tronchin, accompanying Mitchell, carried secret instructions regarding Rousseau.[140] In a news letter to his friend Baron Mure, Mitchell's friend William Rouet mentioned that 'Sir Andrew Mitchell does not go [back to Prussia] till spring', noting immediately after that Hume 'is busy to gett Rousseau disposed of. Till then he is a kind of prisoner'.[141]

In July 1768 Cathcart wrote to Mitchell that Dimsdale was 'the fittest man [who] could have been named for the important purpose for which he is chosen'.[142] The successful inoculation is documented elsewhere.[143] Cathcart told Mitchell that 'you are one of [Dimsdale's] greatest favourites', and, after leaving Russia, Dimsdale stopped at Berlin, to be received by Frederick.[144] Cathcart recommended this because he imagined that Frederick 'will not only chuse to see but to distinguish a Person for whom the Empress possesses so much regard and gratitude (which is the term she uses) and who has performed so great a

---

[134] Mitchell to Burnet, 20 May 1766, Burnett of Kemnay Kemnay Papers, Bundle 82.
[135] Mitchell to Burnet, 31 May 1766, Burnett of Kemnay Kemnay Papers, Bundle 82. This related by François Tronchin in Henry Tronchin, Un médecin du xviiie siècle. Théodore Tronchin (1709-1781) (Paris, 1906), pp. 378-380.
[136] Voltaire described Theodore as six-foot tall, wise as Asclepius and beautiful as Apollo'. See Giacomo Lorandi, 'Théodore Tronchin, doctor to the stars', History Today, 3 March 2018, at https://www.historytoday.com/giacomo-lorandi/th%C3%A9odore-tronchin-doctor-stars, accessed 3 July 2018.
[137] Rousseau had for some time attacked the legitimacy of Geneva's Small Council, on which Theodore Tronchin sat. See Robert Zaretsky and John Scott, The Philosophers' Quarrel: Rousseau, Hume, and the limits of human understanding (New Haven and London, 2009), p. 69.
[138] These details available in Tronchin, *Théodore Tronchin*, pp. 290-291.
[139] Leo Damrosch, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: Restless Genius* (Boston and New York, 2005), p. 419.
[140] Tronchin, *Theodore Tronchin*, p. 293.
[141] William Rouet to Baron Mure, 16 January 1766, in *Selections from the family papers preserved at Caldwell*, Part II, Vol. 2 (Glasgow, 1854), p. 61.
[142] The letter was delivered to Mitchell by Dimsdale, in July 1768, who was passing through Berlin on his way to Russia. See Cathcart to Mitchell, 25 July 1768, BL Add MS 6826, f. 132.
[143] Philip H. Clendenning, 'Dr. Thomas Dimsdale and smallpox inoculation in Russia', *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*, 2 (1973), pp. 109-125.
[144] Cathcart to Mitchell, 2 December 1768, BL Add MS 6826, f. 165v.

Service to the Imperial Family'.[145] Although in a hurry, Mitchell told Cathcart that he persuaded Dimsdale to stay to meet Frederick, and read Cathcart's remarks (above) upon a potential mark of honour by Frederick. However, Frederick received Dimsdale coldly, after making him wait two hours, and merely stated his awareness of Dimsdale's work and wished him good journey. Frederick 'turning short on his heel', reported Dimsdale, 'was gone in a moment. I make no reflections on this reception, but leave you to judge of it from *this* Relation. It seems as if an Englishman was not in fashion there, for upon the whole his Majesty's manner of speaking was far from being gracious'.[146] Mitchell interpreted this potential boon for Prussian science and medicine in his typically insightful way. He wrote to Cathcart that

> The singularity of this Reception would most certainly surprise me if I was less acquainted with the King of Prussia: however I cannot agree with the Baron that it was owing to his being an Englishman. The affront was certainly to the Czarina and to Count Solm's [Prussian envoy in Russia] recommendation.[147]

vi. Science and 'Wissenschaft': Mitchell between differing conceptualisations and uses of knowledge in Britain and Prussia

The ideological battle for science in Prussia had been won by the Newtonians. This was demonstrated in published works of many kinds, most commonly poetry, in which Newtonianism was praised as a systematic answer to many of the problems facing man.[148] While much scientific work was viewed through a religious lens, Newtonians in Prussia worked within and without the religious aspects of science. Science in Prussia, while obviously contemporaneous to Britain, had a somewhat different meaning. It is in this differentiation that the common intermediacy of Andrew Mitchell enabled, and indeed encouraged, scientific progress between the two states and their learned populations.

Throughout this thesis I have used the word 'science' to describe those learned pursuits that do not fit into the alternative major category I explore, literature. Science in this thesis encompasses the fields largely covered by the Royal Society of London. This is not to say, however, that it was identical in Prussia, and I have touched on elements of this differentiation, particularly in the hierarchy, which in the Academy of Sciences was French-led and steered often by Frederick's requirements. We need also, however, to

[145] Cathcart to Mitchell, 28 February 1769, BL Add MS 6286, f. 175v.
[146] Mitchell to Cathcart, 22 April 1769, in Henry Ellis, ed, *Original Letters illustrative of English history*, Vol. 4 (London, 1827), pp. 516-517; Clendenning, 'Dr. Thomas Dimsdale', p. 124.
[147] Mitchell to Cathcart, 22 April 1769, in Ellis, ed, *Original Letters*, pp. 517-518.
[148] See for example William Powell Jones, *The rhetoric of science: A study of scientific ideas and imagery in eighteenth-century English poetry* (London, 1966); Schatzberg, *Scientific themes*.

differentiate somewhat between science and *Wissenschaft*. English-speaking translators for some time translated the German *Wissenschaft* as science, when it in fact does not fit neatly into that box. *Wissenschaft* is 'academic knowledge', 'scholarship', or 'learning' – in Germany, as Denise Phillips has argued, science never developed the strong empirical elements so vital to English and French 'science'.[149] Other authors have also noted the care we need to take when comparing Britain and Germany in the scientific realm.[150] It is nuances such as these that make clear the need to treat learned pursuits of 'science' in Prussia and German-speaking lands with care.

As scholars have shown, the development of the General Directory under Frederick the Great meant the organs of bureaucracy and government were strongly intertwined with knowledge development, experimentation, and research. This is much more pronounced than in Britain, where – until the presidency of Joseph Banks, at least – the Royal Society remained largely independent of political influence.[151] Certainly, in Britain, the proximity of powerful patrons to natural philosophy, for example, was evident, but the overtly political elements of science and knowledge are argued to have not arrived until the 1790s.[152] If it is broadly true that in Britain there was science for science's sake,[153] and we could say that in France, the popularisation of some scientific fields (such as electricity) were capturing the imaginations of the public,[154] then we could characterise Prussian science, in a simple way, by arguing that it was a science of utility and government, as well as a science of scholars. We have seen that there were certainly some elements of national honour involved in the funding of science, as the above British example of the transit of Venus shows. Indeed, Anne Goldgar writes that 'a goal of national academies was, unsurprisingly, to promote the glory of their particular country. This was in large part a tacit condition of funding'.[155] But in Prussia, Frederick admitted that the society was more of a 'department of state' than the aimed-for society of free knowledge exchange.[156]

In Germany (broadly-defined), including Prussia, the natural sciences were looked upon as a spur to economic growth, as Karl Hufbauer has suggested, 'by increasing the efficiency of existing productive

---

[149] Denise Phillips, 'Francis Bacon and the Germans: Stories from when 'science' meant '*Wissenschaft*'', *History of Science*, 53 (2015), pp. 378-394.
[150] Christine Lehleiter, 'Introduction: Fact and Fiction: Literary and scientific cultures in Germany and Britain – Thoughts on a contentious relationship' in Christine Lehleiter, ed, *Fact and Fiction: Literary and scientific cultures in Germany and Britain* (Toronto, Buffalo and London, 2016), p. 5.
[151] The association of politics with Banks' Royal Society presidency is covered by John Gascoigne, *Joseph Banks and the English enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 249-261. Gascoigne notes that Banks sought to bolster the aristocratic ranks of the Royal Society in order to maintain the established nature of the society, particularly in the turbulent age of the French Revolution.
[152] Joe Bord, *Science and Whig manners: Science and political style in Britain, c. 1790-1850* (Houndmills, 2009), pp. 9-10.
[153] Exceptions to this rule obviously exist. One example is from Banks himself who, as president of the Royal Society and a member of the Privy Council, encouraged both the 'scientific conquest' of Australia, as well as the exploitation of that scientific conquest for economic advantage. See John Gascoigne, *The enlightenment and the origins of European Australia* (Cambridge, 2002), p. 86.
[154] A full exploration of science's relationship to itself, and to the public in France, can be found in Sutton, *Science for a polite society*.
[155] Goldgar, *Impolite learning*, pp. 232-233.
[156] *Ibid.*, p. 233.

activities and suggesting new ones'. An example is the growth of technical schools designed to make scientific knowledge practically applicable to the needs of the state departments.[157] Particularly in light of the devastation caused by the Seven Years' War, one of Frederick's chief ministers, Ludwig Philipp von Hagen, began to require the Academy of Sciences to work toward, and promote, technical programs that would contribute to economic and strategic growth of Prussian interests and infrastructure. The development of annual competitions for solving problems of this nature is an example of the gradual demands the government made on the academy and on scientific knowledge in Prussia.[158]

After touring parts of Germany and Prussia with John Pringle, Benjamin Franklin commented to a dinner party gathering in London about his views on the state of Prussia. After hosting the gathering, which included David Hume, John Pringle and George Lewis Scott, Andrew Millar told Mitchell that 'passing through some of the K[ing] of P[russia]'s dominions, [Franklin] told us he saw an excellent likeness of him [Frederick] but it gave him no desire to see the original where the subjects groaned under such oppression'.[159] This testament to the state of Prussia post-war is certainly an endorsement for Frederick's need to revitalise the economy of the state, particularly revenues and efficiency in mining and agriculture.

Before and during the war a process of incorporating technical expertise into government departments had been underway in Prussia. They recruited savants as well as recognising the need for better training of technical experts in the colleges, rather than universities. This, as Ursula Klein has argued, gave rise to what she terms a 'hybrid expert': someone at once a member of the Republic of Letters, but also brought into government technical service to oversee the implementation of technical knowledge through a network of knowledge and information sharing. The 'hybrid expert', argues Klein, 'argued emphatically in favour of an amalgamation of experimentation, hands-on knowledge, mathematics, and conceptually driven analysis that partly relied on knowledge transmitted by texts, diagrams, and other forms of representation'. Moreover, these men mediated the differing scientific traditions of artisan and academic experimentation, and forged new areas of improvement.[160] In short, the new Prussian technical officials brought together their technological know-how with contemporary science to improve Prussian departments such as mining. Experts were becoming the new state officials and this recalibrated the idea of functioning bureaucracy in Prussia, where 'useful science' and 'knowledgeable officials' added their ideas

---

[157] Karl Hufbauer, 'Social support for chemistry in Germany during the eighteenth century: How and why did it change?', *Historical Studies in the Physical Sciences*, 3 (1971), pp. 222, 224.
[158] Hubert C. Johnson, *Frederick the Great and his officials* (New Haven and London, 1975), p. 234.
[159] Andrew Millar to Andrew Mitchell, 28 August 1766, BL Add MS 6858, f. 33. It was on that tour with Franklin that Pringle struck up a long correspondence with J. D. Michaelis of Göttingen, and followed Mitchell's lead in facilitating publications of German authors. See Maurits H. van den Boogert, 'Russell and the Republic of Letters in Aleppo', in Alastair Hamilton, Maurits H. van den Boogert, and Bart Westerweel, eds, *The Republic of Letters and the Levant* (Leiden and Boston, 2005), p. 256; 'Michaelis', in *Encyclopaedia Londinensis; or, Universal Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, and Literature*, Vol. 15 (London, 1817), p. 324. Pringle also corresponded with Albrecht von Haller, furthering that German connection. See Stanley Finger and Marco Piccolino, *The shocking history of electric fishes: From ancient epochs to the birth of modern neurophysiology* (Oxford, 2011), p. 283.
[160] Ursula Klein, 'The laboratory challenge: Some revisions of the standard view of early modern experimentation', *Isis*, 99 (2008), pp. 780-781.

of social advancement to an increasingly 'renewed state bureaucracy'.[161] Mitchell was interested in the mining operations that he encountered during the Seven Years' War, at a time when the new Department for Mining and Smelting Works was forming its ideal of the 'useful sciences', which combined natural and technical knowledge. What was also clear was that the Berlin Academy of Sciences, and Frederick's taking control of Prussian mining operations, embedded knowledge and technical expertise within state power.[162]

There is an innocuous element to Mitchell's visit to the mining and smelting works near Freiberg in Saxony. We can see it as the operation of a curious mind, or even the politeness of a diplomat accepting of an invitation. It can, however, also tell us more about Mitchell's involvement in some finer points of metallurgic chemistry that intersect with this visit. It is also a point of interest that Mitchell would seek to explore metallurgical operations, in view of Frederick's program of reform and change to the technical operations of Prussian mining and its associated commerce. Thus in some way the visit can be seen as a visible reminder to Frederick that Mitchell understood and appreciated his aims, particularly in a time of war (1760) when improvements in iron, for example, were vital to Prussian weaponry such as cannon. Henri de Catt, the King's reader and one familiar with Mitchell, recorded in his diary on 11 March 1760:

> I went with M. Mitchell, M. Burnet and M. Gellert to see the preparation of metals. This M. Gellert is one of the directors of the mines, I am told, who has published an esteemed work, recently translated into French.[163]

Catt thus recorded in a rather matter-of-fact way a quite important piece of information. Gellert was the pre-eminent metallurgical chemist in Germany, a rare and dying trade as the former interests in alchemy were coming to an end, and the age of more scientific metallurgical practice was beginning.[164] Gellert had published two books in German on metallurgic chemistry which were translated into French and published in two volumes as *Chimie métallurgique*.[165] Though it was not translated into English until 1766, Mitchell would have been able to access the French version and perhaps even converse with Gellert in German. It was the beginning of a fruitful association with Gellert and one that would also bring into Mitchell's orbit

---

[161] Ursula Klein, 'The Prussian mining official Alexander von Humboldt', *Annals of Science*, 69 (2012), pp. 29-30.
[162] Ursula Klein, 'Savant officials in the Prussian mining administration', *Annals of Science*, 69 (2012), pp. 350-351, 357, 372.
[163] 'Tagebücher von Henrich de Catt aus den jahren 1758-1760', 11 March 1760, in Reinhold Koser, ed, *Unterhaltungen mit Friedrich dem Großen. Memoiren und Tagebücher von Heinrich de Catt* (Leipzig, 1884), p. 423.
[164] This crossroads is explored in detail in Ursula Klein, 'Apothecary-chemists in eighteenth-century Germany', in Lawrence M. Principe, ed, *New narratives in eighteenth-century chemistry. Contributions from the first Francis Bacon workshop, 21-23 April 2005, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California* (Dordrecht, 2007), pp. 97-137.
[165] Fathi Habashi, 'Christlieb Ehregott Gellert and his metallurgic chymistry', *Bulletin of the History of Chemistry*, 24 (1999), pp. 32-39.

Andreas Sigismund Marggraf, the head of the physics section of the Berlin Academy and also an eminent expert on metals.

The intersection centred around exciting contemporary research into platinum, a material at once new but also with a lengthy history behind it by the time Mitchell became involved with it in 1763. William Lewis F.R.S., physician, experimental chemist and author of *Commercium Philosophico-Technicum* (Philosophical Commerce of the Arts), contacted Mitchell about acting as intermediary in his attempts to connect with German chemists, and also King Frederick. The book was designed to 'promote useful knowledge', to assist 'arts, trades and manufactures, as tending to promote the Kind of Knowledge on which they depend'.[166] Mitchell had been known to Lewis for some time, as subscription for the aforementioned, long-awaited book had begun in 1748.[167] They certainly shared an interest in the promotion of Anglo-German scholarship, as Lewis translated and edited the *Chemical Works of Caspar Neumann* in 1759. As an 'old subscriber' (and possibly known to Mitchell from their Royal Society days), Lewis sent Mitchell copies of his work for Mitchell himself, some directly to Sulzer (who also subscribed others) and one to be presented humbly to Frederick. In addition, he asked that Mitchell distribute copies to Gellert and Marggraf, confirming Mitchell's access to these eminent men.[168] Again, while appearing coincidental, Lewis's letter arrived at a time of increasingly commercial and technical improvement, ordered by Frederick, of the Prussian mining and smelting processes, something that cannot have been lost on Mitchell after his visit to the mines near Freiberg with Gellert some three years earlier.

Lewis wished to have Mitchell as a scientific intermediary, and also to utilise his services to gain access to the latest German publications in science.[169] Lewis's concern was his own ongoing work into platinum, and he told Mitchell that he was desperate to hear from 'that able metallurgist Mr Gellert, especially in regard to any experiments he may have made upon platina: I beg the favour of you to let him have a copy of the Commercium'. Lewis redoubled his reminder to Mitchell to facilitate information from these men, writing 'As Mr Marggraf has proposed to continue his curious experiments on the platina, I beg my compliments to him and his acceptance of one of the copies, and request the favour of him to transmit the account of the experiments as soon as published'. Lewis then furthers his acknowledgement of Mitchell's abilities in this area, recalling that the latest information from Marggraf and Gellert would assist him in furthering his pioneering platinum work, 'the first account of which you [Mitchell] was so kind, with the earl of Northumberland, to communicate to the Royal Society, and which was honoured with their gold medal'. Lewis's note that Mitchell was a co-communicator of his Copley Medal-winning work on platinum is some credit to the diplomat and recalls Mitchell's more active period in the Royal Society, but also his interest in the very latest research. This note by Lewis also corrects the historical record, which credits the

[166] Preface by the earl of Egremont, in William Lewis, *Commercium Philosophico-Technicum; or, the Philosophical Commerce of Arts: designed as an attempt to improve Arts, Trades and Manufactures* (London, 1763).
[167] Frederick G. Page, 'Lewis, William (bap. 1708, d. 1781)', *ODNB*, at https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/16609, accessed 17 January 2018.
[168] William Lewis to Andrew Mitchell, 6 September 1763, BL Add MS 6858, f. 23.
[169] *Ibid.* The remaining citations of Lewis's letter in this paragraph come from this letter. Italics are Lewis's.

earl of Northumberland and William Watson for communicating Lewis's work to the Royal Society.[170] The experimentation on a metal only recently brought back from Spanish South America would certainly have been of some political benefit to Mitchell, Lewis, and the Royal Society.

For Mitchell in Prussia, when Lewis wrote to him, it was still crystal clear that the sociability of the Republic of Letters was, for Frederick, also about fruitful scholarship that could enhance the state and vice versa. Writing an *éloge* to his recently deceased advisor and companion Charles-Etienne Jordan, Frederick said that 'one should not say that the cultivations of the arts and the sciences makes men incapable of business'.[171] As Mitchell showed, he was aware of this Frederician ideology, and Mitchell's continuation of these scientific intermediary activities was a part of his ongoing diplomacy with Frederick.

vii. Conclusion

This chapter has argued first that Andrew Mitchell functioned as an 'intermediary' between Britain and Berlin. His role was defined at the outset of this chapter by a short survey, which established that the intermediary was a powerful force in overcoming social and political boundaries to social exchange. Further, it argued that Mitchell's position of authority (in a knowledge and political sense) allowed him social authority to function as this intermediary. It implicitly linked politics – a fundamental tenet of diplomacy – with knowledge, specifically with an emphasis on some of the main branches of science in the eighteenth century. Second, this chapter reinforced the assertion that knowledge and authority underpinned Mitchell's intermediary work by citing Sulzer's opinion that Mitchell's position in Berlin afforded him unique access to British scientific instruments and their makers. Being able to draw on a wide and influential network as Mitchell was, had shown Sulzer that Mitchell was not only a useful friend, but one with great knowledge of scientific developments.

Third, this chapter has shown that the identity, growth, and power of the state was an ever-present idea in considerations of science and knowledge in eighteenth-century Prussia. Academicians in Berlin worked for their reputations as well as the betterment of their kingdom, particularly in the wake of the Seven Years' War. This chapter has argued that Mitchell was mindful of this, and his chosen friendships in Berlin represent a demonstrable cross-section of Berlin's intellectuals and academicians (which were to some extent one and the same). Lastly, this chapter has attempted to show that differing approaches to science, or *Wissenschaft*, in Prussia and Britain were only compatible to a certain degree before intermediaries were required to mediate that connection. Andrew Mitchell functioned as one of these, and brought his

[170] F. W. Gibbs, 'William Lewis and platina: Bicentenary of the 'Commercium Philosophico-Technicum'', *Platinum Metals Review*, 7 (1963), p. 68.
[171] Goldgar, *Impolite learning*, p. 248.

insight into the uses and nature of science in Berlin to bear on the way in which that scientific knowledge production flowed to Britain, and back again.

The question might also be asked of the information provided in this chapter, whether Andrew Mitchell belonged more in the cosmopolitan Republic of Letters that survived after 1763, or whether the key emphasis of this chapter, the connection between science and the state, was more vital. On the evidence available, Andrew Mitchell was a man of duty who engaged in activities and scientific research predominantly insofar as it overlapped with his work, or when his work commitments allowed him time to take an interest in science. Whether we take one or the other, science plays a significant role. But while Mitchell's scientific interests connected him with a cosmopolitan list of men and women, elements of interest or utility were not always distinguished in his mind. Thus, while the answer to this query is not absolutely clear, a conclusion can be drawn that Mitchell might well have been very aware of a different, wider Republic of Letters, but that he himself was probably not very active in it. Rather his interests were cultivated and expanded in the growing sphere of learned achievements native to individual European states.

When Humphry Davy noted that science could 'soften the asperity of national war', he was talking of a reduction in the possibility that Europe would once more wage violent, horrific war.[172] He, like Mitchell, worked to produce and/or disseminate knowledge and to mitigate the undesirable effects of ignorance on individual behaviour. It is interesting, however, that Davy noted that science could soften the harshness of national war, and not necessarily prevent it. Was this, then, the same as saying that science had a part to play, as competition by other means? While Andrew Mitchell did not expressly advocate or even espouse the view that science could act as a form of surrogate or 'soft' diplomacy, his actions most definitely show an awareness of the role scientific achievement could play in potentially diverting states away from hostility and toward the support of knowledge, such as Harrison's marine chronometer, Dollond's telescope, or Bird's quadrant, that fostered a different form of diplomatic relations.[173]

[172] Davy spoke these words in or about 1808, when he was awarded the prize of the National Institute of France, but was prevented from going to France to accept his award by the Napoleonic Wars. For the quote, see *The collected works of Sir Humphry Davy*, ed. John Davy, Vol. 1 (London, 1839), p. 466.
[173] There has been no identify trends in the membership and relationship of German learned men to the Royal Society in London, as there has been with Russian intellectual life and the Royal Society. See Edouard Kolchinsky, Uwe Hossfeld, and Georgy S. Levit, 'Russian scientists and the Royal Society of London: 350 years of scientific collaboration', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, https://doi.org/10.1098/rsnr.2017.0001, accessed 8 September 2018.

Chapter 6

Literature and diplomacy between Prussia and Britain

i. Introduction: A literary past and present

Mitchell, as noted earlier in this thesis, had a long-standing interest in the promotion of literature and literary figures. Through his friendships alone he would have been exposed to great works of literary genius. Early in his career he had pursued of a more integral role in the development of literature and its associated taste, through such groups as the Society for the Encouragement of Learning. His close friendship with Scots such as Andrew Millar likewise reinforced his exposure to the latest publications. As has been shown, Millar utilised Mitchell as one of his 'triers', asking him to read over work prior to its publication and to offer his thoughts. This he did, for example, with Henry Fielding's *Amelia*, which Mitchell was said to have thought inferior to that author's *Tom Jones*, and advised Millar to sell it as soon as possible. In subscribing to, and promoting, such works as Thomas Blackwell's *Memoirs of the Court of Augustus* and Robert Wood's *Ruins of Palmyra*, Mitchell showed himself to be an astute judge of quality.[174]

Mitchell was on familiar terms with David Hume and came into possession of one of Hume's more regrettably vulnerable manuscripts. His possession of this manuscript sheds light on his associations with Hume and Chesterfield, and the latter's son Philip Stanhope. In this chapter I shall detail those written by Hume which encompass his familiarity with Mitchell and its implications for them both.[175] They show Hume's trust in Mitchell to keep one his valuable, worrisome, manuscripts safe. Some publically popular letters of Lord Chesterfield were also in Mitchell's possession for a time. They later came into the possession of Eugenia Stanhope, Philip's widow, when she published a supplement to the 'Chesterfield letters'.[176] The trust placed in Mitchell by Stanhope must serve to show the discretion which the former exercised in diplomatic affairs both public and private, and also confirms Hume's faith in him was well-founded.

This chapter aims to examine Mitchell's literary and philosophical standing in Prussia and around parts of Germany, which was derived from his connections in those spheres. It is pivotal to the reconstruction

[174] Mitchell's involvement with these works is outlined in previous chapters.
[175] Stanhope visited the Prussian court in 1752 and 1755 but this was not during Mitchell's tenure. Those written by Chesterfield to his son fell into the possession of Mitchell, and we can only surmise that Stanhope gave them to Mitchell enclosed in other letters. Mitchell held on to these, and remarked upon them to Frederick.
[176] Eugenia Stanhope in the preface to *Supplement to the Letters written by the late Right Honourable Philip Dormer Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield, to his son, Philip Stanhope, esq* (London, 1787). The conditions are also mentioned in Sidney L. Gulick, Jr, 'The publication of Chesterfield's letters to his son', *PMLA*, 51 (1936), pp. 165-177. Eugenia Stanhope, in the preface to the supplement, could not directly ascertain how they came to be with Mitchell. They then passed to her through William Forbes, a member of the family who had inherited Mitchell's papers.

of 'new diplomatic history' that instances of engagement with culture are investigated in the context of the diplomat's working life. In this way, light can be shed on the instances – such as Mitchell's introduction of German authors to Frederick – that show the intersection of diplomacy and culture to be both purposeful and beneficial. The chapter begins by outlining the status of literature and philosophy in Germany and Prussia in the time of Mitchell and Hume. It then adds evidence to the familiarity of Mitchell and Hume, in order to argue that while the two were not intimate friends, Mitchell held a strong affection for Hume which, combined with their familiarity, could have augmented Mitchell's reputation in Berlin.

Some of these letters between Mitchell and Hume are, to the best of my knowledge, quoted here for the first time. They do not appear in the most recent edition of Hume letters, edited by Felix Waldmann.[177] They show a different side of Mitchell, one at odds with his tough Scottish diplomatic exterior, and one more familiar, friendly, and playful. His writing to Hume demonstrates probably the only occasion where Mitchell literally writes of affection for a correspondent. Mitchell's unexplored interactions with Hume shed light on Mitchell's place in the British and German literary worlds.

The chapter then moves towards investigating the intersection of Andrew Mitchell, Frederick the Great, David Hume, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. It does so in order to further contextualise Mitchell's minor involvement with Hume and Rousseau's famed skirmish in England, but also to supplement this with context about Frederick's disposition towards Hume and Rousseau. Mitchell's patronage of the artist and writer Henry Fuseli, whom he took to England, adds a further dimension to this discussion.

Building on Mitchell's links to literature and philosophy in Germany, I then explore Mitchell's introduction of German authors and intellectuals to Frederick in Leipzig in 1760-1761. This was a series of meetings that exposed Frederick to German minds that he had not fully appreciated, and who showed him that the learned Germans in this field could make great contributions. Though Christian Fürchtegott Gellert was the greatest recipient of Mitchell's patronage, Gellert was at times fearful of the advancements being made on his behalf. In the end, however, he was both grateful and honoured by Mitchell's help. Mitchell's patronage of Gellert has been previously explored in German, and though Patrick Doran noted Mitchell's contact with Gottsched and Gellert, in this chapter I put this into the context of English-language diplomatic studies for what I believe to be the first time.

I conclude that Andrew Mitchell was in a reasonably defined position as a respected authority on British literature and philosophy in Prussia and broader Germany. While his contributions were not innovative, they were carried out in Mitchell's usual diplomatic method: cautiously, with perspicuity and prudence as to the aims and possible outcomes of his actions. He was learning German, he was encouraging native authors and philosophers in his gentle manner. Mitchell should not be placed among the true influencers

[177] Felix Waldmann, ed, *Further letters of David Hume* (Edinburgh, 2014).

of eighteenth-century German literature and philosophy, but his contributions nevertheless demonstrate his ability to identify needs, trends, and talent, and to encourage their growth.

ii. German literature and philosophy in the time of Hume and Mitchell

In order to ascertain the implications of Mitchell's actions and friendships in regard to German literature and philosophy, I first need to note here some important elements.

a. Literature in Germany in the mid-eighteenth century

A collection of essays by English and German literature expert Bernhard Fabian states the strong literary connection between these two places:

> It is well known that the presence in Germany of a large body of English literature was a powerful incentive to literary development and a major factor in precipitating that outburst of literary activity which brought forth, in the later decades of the century, the literature of Storm and Stress and of early German Classicism. It is also known, though not yet adequately documented, that with the spread of English culture England became an important force in the political and social thinking of Germany.[178]

With this quote Fabian framed an argument that broke new ground in understanding the cultural influence of England in Germany and which, in the argument of this chapter, might have assisted Andrew Mitchell in gaining a stronger cultural, and possibly political, standing in Prussia. In broader terms, Fabian argued that in terms of the relationship of England and Germany, 'from the Germans' point of view, theirs was a massive attempt to assimilate a foreign culture in all its manifestations and to use it as a stimulus in their efforts to modernise the country'.[179] Other areas of literary exchange strengthen Fabian's argument.

[178] Bernhard Fabian, 'English books and their eighteenth-century German readers', in Bernhard Fabian, *Selecta Anglicana: Buchgeschichtliche Studien zur Aufnahme der English Literatur in Deutschland im achtzehnten jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden, 1994), pp. 11-95, this quote on p. 11.
[179] Bernhard Fabian, 'The discovery of English culture', in Bernhard Fabian, *The English book in eighteenth-century Germany*, The Panizzi Lectures (London, 1991), p. 4. Fabian expresses a similar sentiment in the subsequent chapter, 'Modes of transmission', pp. 37-38.

'Empfindsamkeit', or 'sensibility', was a prevalent literary trope in Germany from the 1740s to the 1770s.[180] It found expression in novels that drew heavily upon the literary styles forged in Britain at this time. Moreover, novels, poetry and drama as genres of literature were very influential in Germany from the 1740s and 1750s, appearing in new book fair lists at Leipzig and being marked in translations and in originals.[181] As Astrid Krake has noted, 'the history of German literature in the eighteenth century is largely the history of English literature in German translation'.[182] Sensibility was one of a number of literary styles which Germans were exposed to by those who sought to translate English language works into German. Among these, Gellert and Gotthold Ephraim Lessing[183] were some of the earliest and most successful, and they also happened to have a close link to Andrew Mitchell.[184] The links here may at first sound circumstantial, but there is a logic in the movement of literature that shows that Andrew Mitchell could certainly have been seen as a man not only very well versed in English literature, but also as a person whose friendship could offer German writers more credibility at home. German interaction with English literature in the eighteenth century started with Addison and Steele, not only for the prose style but also for the 'simple, clear and logically compelling style', echoed also by Pope.[185] As Michael Maurer has argued, in Germany, it was 'mainly the product of enlightened propaganda and publication strategy that formed the image of England as a model country and led to the emergence of a pronounced anglophilia'.[186] It was not only Germans comprehending the value of English literature – they were also being told this by various literary giants from Voltaire to Montesquieu.[187] German interest in English literature was cemented by the Berlin Academy's prize question for 1755 (announced in 1753), which asked entrants to examine the thought system of Alexander Pope.[188] Moreover, between 1742 and 1768 eleven of Britain's most important novels by Richardson, Fielding, Smollett, Sterne and Goldsmith found translation in Germany. The areas of the literary market in Germany once dominated by France were now dominated by Britain, most particularly, the novel.[189]

---

[180] Anna Richards, 'The era of sensibility and the novel of self-fashioning', in Barbara Becker-Cantarino, ed, *German literature of the eighteenth century: The enlightenment and sensibility* (Rochester, NY and Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 223-244.
[181] Fabian, 'The discovery of English culture', pp. 14-20.
[182] Astrid Krake, '"Translating to the moment' – marking and Anglomania: the first German translation of Richardson's *Clarissa* (1747/1748)' in Stefanie Stockhorst, ed, *Cultural transfer through translation: The circulation of enlightened through in Europe by means of translation* (Amsterdam and New York, 2010), pp. 103-120.
[183] Lessing argued that Gottsched, for so long dominant in the realm of German literary taste, should be done away with, and that English, and Shakespeare in particular, should be embraced as models for German theatre and writing. See Barbara Fischer and Thomas C. Fox, 'Lessing's life and work', in Barbara Fischer and Thomas C. Fox, eds, *A companion to the works of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing* (Rochester, NY and Woodbridge, 2005), p. 24.
[184] On Lessing, see Jutta Meise, *Lessings Anglophilie* (Frankfurt am Main, 1997).
[185] Horst Oppel, *English-deutsche Literaturbeziehungen*, Vol. 1, *Von den Anfängen bis zum Ausgang des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1971), pp. 61-62. Oppel's exhaustive research has shown strong and deep links between English and German literature in the eighteenth-century (and prior).
[186] Michael Maurer, 'Germany's image of eighteenth-century England', in Joseph Canning and Hermann Wellenreuther, eds, *Britain and Germany compared: Nationality, society and nobility in the eighteenth century* (Göttingen, 2001), pp. 15-36, this on page 23.
[187] *Ibid.*, p. 24.
[188] Nisbet, *Gotthold Ephraim Lessing*, p. 174.
[189] Oppel, *English-deutsche Literaturbeziehungen*, p. 127.

Christian Fürchtegott Gellert, who will be discussed in depth below, was in the vanguard of German writers who adopted English literary styles in the middle of the eighteenth century, as well as the philosophies prevailing in England and Scotland.[190] Alexander Pope has been among those mentioned as one of the main entry points of German translators looking at the English language, and utilising it to improve the expressivity of the German language as well as its themes and philosophies.[191] This became an aspect of many other translations of many other authors, not merely Pope, and can be seen in the discussions of translations by Gellert and others. Recall in Chapter 2 I noted the poet Kleist's work in trying to have Lessing appointed as Mitchell's secretary. It should be noted, vis à vis the points above about Gellert, that Kleist was also a translator who attempted to put Pope's *Essay on Man* into German, and Lessing worked to translated numerous works by Pope, including his 'Universal Prayer' and 'The Dying Christian to his Soul, Ode'.[192]

b. Trends in philosophy in Germany in the mid-eighteenth century: the case of David Hume

Michael Maurer has noted that for eighteenth-century Germans, England was the 'land of the philosophers', and were praised for their independence of thought, rationality, common sense, and relative lack of prejudice.[193] This naturally led them to enquire further into the philosophical products of British culture. Scottish philosophy and political thought was prevalent in eighteenth-century Germany. It seemed to be accepted among the learned German circles that Scottish philosophy was as useful and congenial for their thinking as English (under whose name Scottish philosophy had been placed).[194] There was certainly a rigorous philosophical debate taking place in Germany, particularly from the middle of the century when an influx of newly translated ideas stimulated more and more debate, particularly moral-sense and common-sense theory.[195] As Engbers noted, 'the reception of the moral-sense theory through Gellert, Lessing and Wieland is part of a general moral-philosophical discussion, in which their friends, correspondents, or journalistic adversaries took part.'[196] It was clear also that Mitchell was still well-read when it came to

[190] These themes are explored in Michael Maurer, *Aufklärung und Anglophilie in Deutschland* (Göttingen and Zürich, 1987). Hugh Barr Nisbet's biography of Lessing also brings a great range of German writers into the great burgeoning interest in English language writings in Germany in the middle of the eighteenth century. See Hugh Barr Nisbet, *Gotthold Ephraim Lessing: His Life, Works, and Thought* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 173-174.
[191] John Guthrie, 'Eighteenth-century German translations of Pope's poetry', *Publications of the English Goethe Society*, 82 (2013), pp. 67-84.
[192] *Ibid.*, pp. 71, 76-77.
[193] Maurer, *Aufklärung und Anglophilie*, p. 60.
[194] Fania Oz-Salzberger, 'Scottish political ideas in eighteenth century Germany: The case of Adam Ferguson', PhD Diss., University of Oxford (Oxford, 1991), p. 12.
[195] Jan Engbers, *Der "Moral-Sense" bei Gellert, Lessing und Wieland. Zur Rezeption von Shaftesbury und Hutcheson in Deutschland* (Heidelberg, 2001).
[196] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

philosophy. His correspondence with James Harris Sr is an example of his.[197] Harris had written two philosophical works by the time Mitchell wrote to him, the first being *Three Treatises* and the second *Hermes, or, A Philosophical Enquiry Concerning Universal Grammar* in 1751, for which he became known as 'Hermes Harris'.

> Your son some time ago made me a present of your Works which I have read with equal pleasure and Instruction, and he mentioned to me some papers of the late Lord Shafftesbury's, remarks upon Horace, which I hope you will one day give to the public, as no author of Antiquity better deserves such a commentator.[198]

As a member of the Rankenian Society at Edinburgh, Mitchell had, alongside David Hume, also debated the merits of George Berkeley's work. Both of the latter were to form vital parts of the work of philosophers in Germany, in particular Immanuel Kant.[199]

In more general terms, the strong connection of Scottish and German philosophy in the eighteenth century has long been noted. Manfred Kuehn argues that 'the Scots were very well-known by German philosophers; and their works had a significant influence upon the development of German thought', citing the growing interest in specifically Scottish philosophers as early as the mid-1750s through Moses Mendelssohn,[200] and certainly from the late 1760s and into the early 1770s.[201] Moreover, Kuehn argues that 'without the Scots there would have been no Kant'.[202] While some of this might have come too late to assist Mitchell in his diplomacy, earlier German interest in British philosophy suggests Hume might have been seen as a 'calling card' for Mitchell to establish his credibility and to attract intellectual friendship.[203] Kant

---

[197] Mitchell had numerous connections to the Harris family, having of course hosted James Harris Jr (his future successor in Berlin) in 1767. Harris Sr. was the nephew of Lord Shaftesbury and edited some of his works, and was a close friend of his son, the fourth earl of Shaftesbury. See Daniel Carey, *Locke, Shaftesbury and Hutcheson: Contesting diversity in the Enlightenment and beyond* (Cambridge, 2005), p. 108n32; Rosemary Dunhill, 'Harris, James (1709-1780)', *ODNB,* at https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/12393, accessed 16 July 2018, who notes Harris's philosophical powers in their own right; Isabel Rivers, *Reason, Grace and Sentiment: A study of the language of religion and ethics in England 1660-1780*, Vol. 2, *Shaftesbury to Hume* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 91-92 and n32, and pp. 115-116 where Rivers notes Harris's expertise on Shaftesbury's work.

[198] Andrew Mitchell to James Harris Sr., 24 October 1767, 9M73/G523, Malmesbury Papers, Hampshire Records Office.

[199] Wayne Waxman, *Kant and the empiricists: Understanding understanding* (Oxford, 2005), p. 11. For a critique of Waxman's interpretation, which also furthers this discussion, see Brian A. Chance, 'Sensibilism, psychologism, and Kant's debt to Hume', *Kantian Review*, 16 (2011), pp. 325-349, particularly pp. 327-333.

[200] Kuehn, *Scottish common sense*, p. 41.

[201] Manfred Kuehn, 'The early reception of Reid, Oswald, and Beattie in Germany: 1768-1800', *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 21 (1983), p. 480; see also Kuehn, *Scottish common sense*, p. 6.

[202] Kuehn, *Scottish common sense*, p. 248; Dieter Henrich, 'Hutcheson and Kant', in Karl Ameriks and Otfried Höffe, eds, Nicholas Walker, trans., *Kant's Moral and Legal Philosophy* (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 30-32. The latter essay was originally printed in 1958.

[203] Unfortunately, Mitchell never seems to have recorded his own thoughts on Hume's philosophy, which might have assisted in understanding Prussian and broader German conceptions of Mitchell as one on familiar terms with

cited Hume more than any other sole author,[204] and, along with Shaftesbury and Hutcheson,[205] as an inspiration and one of his philosophical predecessors. Moreover, Hume made his greatest impact on German readers in the period from 1739 into the early 1770s.[206] As Kuehn notes, despite beginning by publishing anonymously in Germany, by 1755, Hume is 'referred to as a well-known author who no longer needs any introduction' and was 'discussed a great deal in German philosophical circles' owing to translations.[207] Further scholarship has also taken Kuehn's work and continued to emphasise the importance of Hume in Germany from the 1750s, as well as Reid, Beattie, and Oswald from the late 1760s, and Scottish philosophy in general during this period and after, revealing itself also in the work of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe and Johann Georg Hamann, among others.[208] In Chapter 5 I also noted the important work of Sulzer in translating Hume's work and opening it up to a wider audience.[209]

All this supposes that Mitchell was in contact with learned men around Germany, for which supposition there is only the evidence I have elaborated on in this thesis thus far. The above arguments have been elaborated in order to show the sense of understanding and interest in Hume's work, and those of other Scottish and British philosophers, in Germany by mid-century. In Berlin, Mitchell almost certainly discussed Hume with Sulzer. Sulzer had translated Hume's work into German.[210] Hume was also much discussed in the Berlin Academy during the time of Mitchell's diplomatic mission in Prussia. Jean Bernard Mérian was tasked with translating Hume's *Enquiry concerning human understanding* into French in 1758, at the request of Academy president Maupertuis, and its perpetual secretary, J. H. S. Formey.[211] In Formey's view, he wanted Hume translated in order to prevent the curiosity that would come from interested readers if he were to leave it to lay or non-philosophical readers.[212] According to the authors of the paper on Mérian's translation, 'the scientists of the Prussian Academy were not responsible for assimilating Hume's scepticism

---

Hume. The only recorded instance I can locate of Mitchell's thoughts on Hume's work is in the letter cited later in this chapter where Mitchell notes to Hume 'As a Historian I have implicit faith in you, as a Philosopher I Revere you'. While he may not have agreed with all of Hume's work, he would certainly have been seen as a supporter of Hume in Germany, and one who might be able to offer an anecdote on Hume.

[204] Robert B. Louden, 'A writer more excellent than Cicero: Hume's influence on Kant's anthropology', in Elizabeth Robinson and Chris W. Suprenant, eds, *Kant and the Scottish enlightenment* (New York and Abingdon, 2017), pp. 164-165.

[205] Aaron Garrett, 'Hutcheson on the unity of virtue and right' in Robinson and Suprenant, eds, *Kant and the Scottish enlightenment*, p. 29.

[206] Kuehn, 'Reception', pp. 29-30; see also Manfred Kuehn, 'Kant's critique of Hume's theory of faith', in M. A. Stewart and John P. Wright, eds, *Hume and Hume's connexions* (Edinburgh, 1994), pp. 239-255.

[207] *Ibid.*, pp. 38-39.

[208] Goethe's interest in Scottish philosophy, and that of late eighteenth-century German intellectuals, is outlined in R. H. Stephenson, 'Weimar classicism's debt to the Scottish enlightenment', in Nicholas Boyle and John Guthrie, eds, *Goethe and the English-speaking world: Essays from the Cambridge Symposium for his 250th anniversary* (Rochester, NY and Woodbridge, 2002), pp. 61-70. Hamann visited England in 1757-58 and engaged with Hume's work there, bringing his interest back home. See Isaiah Berlin, 'Hume and German anti-rationalism', in *Against the current: Essays in the history of ideas*, ed. Henry Hardy (New York, 1980), p. 171.

[209] See also Klemme, *Reception*, p. vii.

[210] John Christian Laursen and Richard Popkin, with a French translation by Peter Briscoe, 'Hume in the Prussian academy: Jean Bernard Mérian's 'On the phenomenalism of David Hume'', *Hume Studies*, 1 (1997), p. 155.

[211] Laursen, Popkin, and Briscoe, 'Hume in the Prussian academy', pp. 153-154.

[212] *Ibid.*, pp. 154-155.

into the modern world view, but rather resisted it whenever it seemed to threaten religion'.[213] This is perhaps why the work was left to philosophers within the Academy, such as Mérian.

Did Mitchell discuss Hume with Frederick?[214] Perhaps he discussed Hume in relation to the Swiss philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau and the Hume's falling out with Rousseau? And if so, what was Frederick's position on Hume? And, furthermore, did Mitchell's knowledge of Hume give him cache as a diplomat? The following section explores Mitchell's relationship to Hume in more detail, along with these questions. It does so due to the immense importance that being on familiar terms with Hume would have given Mitchell in Prussia and around Germany. If, as courtier Dieudonné Thiébault noted, friendship with Montesquieu preceded Mitchell in Prussia, then a familiarity with Hume could only have positively benefited his cultural credibility when it came to dealing in diplomacy.

iii. Mitchell, David Hume, Frederick, and the Germans

a. The familiarity of Mitchell and Hume

The familiarity between David Hume and Andrew Mitchell went back to their time at the University of Edinburgh, where Hume and Mitchell attended Greek classes together.[215] They had been a part of the Rankenian Club together, as argued in Chapter 2, and had probably been reunited in London between 1737 and 1739. At this time Hume was in London and attended many of Thomson's plays, and is thought to also have associated with Thomson's circle, frequented also by Mitchell.[216] Roger Emerson has shown that Hume and Mitchell's political and professional ambitions probably overlapped to a large extent in the 1740s. Between 1744-1745 and again in 1751-1752, Hume sought unsuccessfully to gain appointment to two university professorships in Scotland. Mitchell might have indirectly participated in these campaigns as a Squadrone politician in 1744-45, prior to the collapse of Tweedale's office after the '45.[217] Not showing any sign of negativity towards Mitchell's roles in the university appointments, Hume was pleased to see Mitchell standing for the parliamentary seat of Aberdeen in 1747, and believed he would be successful.[218] Hume seems to have seen Mitchell in Scotland in 1751, but Hume does not mention the business for which

[213] *Ibid.*, pp. 155-156.
[214] Frederick's reader Catt records that Frederick 'wrote a philosophical epistle on the systems of the philosophers, which he addressed to Sir Andrew Mitchell', however, there is no existing copy of this that I can ascertain. See Henri de Catt, *Frederick the Great: The memoirs of his reader Henri de Catt 1758-1760*, Vol. 2, trans. F. S. Flint (London, 1905), p. 326.
[215] Greig, ed, *The letters of David Hume*, Vol. 1, *1727-1765*, p. 101n7; Mossner, *Life of Hume*, p. 108.
[216] Mossner, *Life of Hume*, p. 108n1. As Alexander Dick writes to Hume, '… a great while ago in the days of Mr. Thomson and Mr. Mitchel the ambassador with whomme we used to associate in those days'.
[217] Roger L. Emerson, 'The "affair" at Edinburgh and the "project" at Glasgow: the politics of Hume's attempts to become a professor', in Stewart and Wright, eds, *Hume and Hume's connexions*, pp. 1-22.

[218] David Hume to John Clephane, 18 June 1747, in Greig, ed, *The letters of David Hume*, Vol. 1, pp. 101-102.

Mitchell was in Scotland. Hume wrote to a friend that he chose to stay in Scotland for the moment rather than going on 'Jaunts & Rambling' to London.

> This Inclination to Study & Repose is the chief Reason why I refus'd a very kind Invitation from Mr Mitchell to travel along with him. I agree in your Opinion of him; & regret very much that so sensible agreeable a Man shou'd possess such bad Health & bad Spirits.[219]

Interestingly, Hume observes Mitchell's poor health at even this stage of his life. Mitchell certainly suffered bouts of ill-health during the Seven Years' War, but also whenever he attended long sessions of parliament, for example in February 1766 when he told Burnet that sitting in Parliament felt longer than the entire Prussian campaign of the Seven Years' War, he was very prone to fatigue.[220] What Hume notes as Mitchell's 'bad Spirits' is difficult to decipher, although Mitchell's visits to Scotland never seem to have been pleasant experiences for him, and he appeared to be always much happier in London.

Emerson has noted that Hume observed with some interest the activities of the Commission of Annexed Estates, set up to oversee the annexation, appropriation, confiscation, return, or sale of Scottish Highland estates in the wake of the '45. Mitchell served on this commission, and was a minority supporter of Newcastle in a commission filled with Argyll's choices. Moreover, Emerson sees Hume's *Political Discourses* of 1752 as a direct criticism of the aims and activities of the commission.[221] Intervening years brought little evidence of letters or linkages between the two except that they shared many common friends, including Andrew Millar. It was not until 1756 that Mitchell re-occurs in Hume's letters, but it was an important recurrence.

In 1756 Hume had intended to publish a series of *Four Dissertations*, but which, meeting with some critical viewpoints on the fourth essay on geometry, he decided to reduce to three. His publisher, Andrew Millar, thought three essays an inadequate amount for a volume, and so Hume added two essays 'Of the Immortality of the Soul', and 'Of Suicide'. These were subsequently printed and set to be sold, but Hume says that he 'repented', and attributed this repentance to his 'abundant Prudence'.[222] Judging this to be an odd case, historians have enquired into Hume's late change of mind. Mossner points to evidence that these essays were in fact seen as 'incendiary', and a contemporary in Scotland believed that Millar 'dares not sell' the *Dissertations* with the two contentious new essays attached. Some attributed this to the campaigns of various critics of Hume's work, and to supposed threats to Hume and Millar, one of which was rumoured

[219] David Hume to Cochrane Stewart, 8 August 1751, in Waldmann, ed, *Further letters of David Hume*, p. 100.
[220] Mitchell to Burnet, 17 February 1766, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Bundle 82.
[221] Roger L. Emerson, 'The Scottish contexts for David Hume's political-economic thinking', in Carl Wennerlind and Margaret Schabas, eds, *David Hume's political economy* (Abingdon and New York, 2008), p. 22.
[222] David Hume to William Strahan, 25 January 1772, in Greig, ed, *The letters of David Hume*, Vol. 2, *1766-1776* (Oxford, 1932), pp. 252-254.

to be delivered by Lord Chancellor Hardwicke.[223] Millar was known to send works to his friends for proofreading prior to publication, as he had done with Fielding's *Amelia* in sending it to Mitchell.

Hume was aware of the risks to his reputation that would occur if his publisher, Andrew Millar, were to let copies out into the public domain. It becomes clear that Millar must have given a copy of the *Dissertations* to Mitchell before promising to burn the remains of the offending published works. Hume's response to this discovery speaks to Mitchell's familiarity with Hume, Millar's faith in Mitchell, Mitchell's character, and his reputation. Hume stated simply that 'I have no Objection to Mr Mitchels having a Copy of the Dissertations', despite the 'notoriety' of the works 'remaining to plague Hume throughout the rest of his life'.[224] It seems that, in the event, Mitchell's copy was the only one of these dangerous documents allowed to exist outside the couple that Hume reserved for himself, and while a handful more would emerge almost a decade later, they were not linked to Mitchell. While Hume noted 'an Infidelity or Negligence in the case' of the suppression of the dissertations, 'the case' to which Hume refers is, in my reading, the case of the existence of copies of the dissertation, not the case of Mitchell's ownership. This would be supported by Hume's subsequent explanation that Morehead had a copy, and 'other Copies have got abroad', abroad here meaning out of Hume's possession and into the public. In any case, we have no reason to doubt Mitchell's security, as this event occurs in 1772, the year after Mitchell's death. If his papers were exposed, it would be by the work of another party and not Mitchell. It might also be added that, in the opinion of J. C. A. Gaskin, Mitchell's copy 'presumably went with him to Berlin, thereafter to disappear from history'.[225] One copy in the ownership of William Morehead, a prominent Scottish book collector whose library was sold after his death in 1766; another had been in the possession of John Wilkes until Millar claimed to have destroyed it.[226] In any case, a copy was sent to France, where it was published in 1770. In 1772, when copies appeared on the British market, Hume believed Mitchell would had kept the manuscript safe, writing to William Strahan that 'Mr Millar assurd me very earnestly that all the Copies were suppress'd, except one which he sent to Sir Andrew Mitchell, in whose Custody I thought it safe'.[227] On his deathbed Hume continued to fight to recover any stray copies of the work, proving its vital importance to him.[228]

J. Y. T. Greig, compiler of the first modern comprehensive set of Hume's letters, observed of Mitchell and Hume's friendship that 'Hume always remained on friendly, though not very intimate, terms with him'.[229] Letters preserved in the Hume manuscripts in the National Library of Scotland, however, cast doubt on this claim. While there is no conclusive proof of a strong bond or friendship, the two nevertheless

---

[223] Mossner, 'Hume's 'Four Dissertations', pp. 37-57. A full explanation by Hume can also be found in Hume, *A Dissertation on the Passions*, pp. xxii-xxiv.
[224] David Hume to Andrew Millar, Edinburgh 27 May 1756, in Greig, ed, *The letters of David Hume*, Vol. 1, p. 232.
[225] J. C. A. Gaskin, 'Hume suppressed dissertations: An authentic text', *Hermathena*, 106 (1968), p. 55.
[226] In Hume's letter to Millar of 27 May 1756, he noted, 'But I have since found that there either was some Infidelity or Negligence in the case; For on Mr Morehead's Death, there was found a Copy, which his Nephew deliverd up to me'. Hume to Millar, 27 May 1756, in Greig, ed, *The letters of David Hume*, Vol. 1, p. 232. For Wilkes, see Mossner, 'Hume's 'Four Dissertations'', pp. 50-52.
[227] Hume to Strahan, 25 January 1772, in Greig, ed, *The letters of David Hume*, Vol. 2, p. 253.
[228] *Ibid.*, p. 331.
[229] Greig, ed, *The letters of David Hume*, Vol. 1, p. 101.

exchanged letters that were both light-hearted and familiar. Though Hume seems to have been negligent in maintaining a correspondence with Mitchell – perhaps owing to Hume's work in the Secretary of State's office in the late 1760s – the two retained a familiarity that shows much affection and care, particularly on the part of Mitchell for Hume. Mitchell kept abreast of news of Hume through their mutual network, which included Andrew Millar, William Strahan (one of Hume's booksellers and closest friends), and the Earl Marischal, the renowned Scottish resident in Berlin. In England from 1764, Mitchell might have dined with Hume; but he nevertheless received the latest news when in the company of Millar. Hume wrote to Millar from Paris on January 14, 1765, that he intended to go on with his *History of England* in France, where he could have access to family papers of French noblemen, and stay as far away from Scotophobic England as possible.[230] Millar replied on January 25 that 'Mr Mitchell from Berlin was [with] me when I [received] yours and was much pleased'.[231]

Hume did indeed write to Mitchell, though not until 1767, and a surviving letter recently published by Adam Budd shows Hume to hold the same familiar affection toward Mitchell that the subsequent letters in this section show Mitchell to have held for Hume. Of the letter he published in the *Times Literary Supplement*, Budd writes that Hume is 'as polished and as self-conscious as ever, which is intriguing, because its playful self-accusations characterise those aspects of Hume's public identity that he had sought, for so long, to ignore'.[232] Hume had jested, 'what are you, say you? Or are you giving yourself airs of being a Man of Consequence?', advising Mitchell that, as an Undersecretary to Conway,

> I wou'd advise you to be civil to me, and not treat me with Disdain, as a Scholastic, and a Philosopher, and a man of another World, and a Speculatist and a Recluse. I assure you I scorn all those Epithets, and aspire to the Character of a Politician and a Man of Business, Names of much great Dignity and Respect, in this part of the World.[233]

Mitchell in fact did have cause to write to Hume directly, when the latter was working in the office of Henry Seymour Conway, Secretary of State for the Southern Department. This would have brought Mitchell into administrative contact with Hume's office but only this letter written by Mitchell survives by his hand. It demonstrates Mitchell's familiar affection for Hume, while also showing Mitchell to be more light-hearted and even irreverent when it comes to Hume. Possibly it is that Mitchell thinks Hume enjoys

---

[230] David Hume to Andrew Millar, 14 January 1765, in John Hill Burton, ed, *Life and correspondence of David Hume*, Vol. 2 (Edinburgh, 1846), pp. 264-265.
[231] Andrew Millar to David Hume, 25 February 1765, NLS Hume MSS 23156, No. 33. Cf. Hume MSS [formerly] in the possession of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, Australian National University Microfilm, Volume Reel VI, No. 33.
[232] Budd, 'Men of consequence', p. 14.
[233] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

this more light-hearted conversation; possibly it is also drawing from their long association. As far as I can ascertain this letter has not previously been published.

My Dear Sir,

As the hart thirsteth after the water brook, so have I for a letter from you, and now that there seems to be a Cessation of Politicks, I speak from the News Papers, I hope you will favour me with a few lines to enable me with some sort of Intelligence to answer the Questions that are put to me. I neither desire nor expect secrets, but yet would be glad to say something.

The inclosed letter has been by a mistake of Burnet's been mislaid in his Bureau, but I hope it is of no consequence and the like shall not happen again. I am very affectionately,

Yours, &c.,

Andr: Mitchell.[234]

It is worth highlighting that Mitchell rarely, if ever, signs his letters 'affectionately'. The letter is quite clear in its admittances of affection and reverence for Hume. Though no reply from Hume has been found, Mitchell wrote again on a patronage issue, replying to a (missing) letter of Hume's from 11 December 1767. In his reply Mitchell included several personal notes to Hume which have only been published in excerpt in the above-noted Adam Budd article. The letter also contains Mitchell's anger at the British ministry's latest breakdown, and laments how, even a month before, Hume had said that the political situation seemed stable. Yet with Conway finally pushed out as Secretary of State for the Northern Department in January 1768,[235] Hume, as Conway's Secretary, was set to depart with him, and Mitchell had little hope left to correspond so easily with Hume.

Dear Sir,

I wrote you a short note by the last Post, but had not then time to answer your obliging letter of the 11th December which gave me great pleasure as it promised much stability, but alas! How are my expectations blasted, I have just Received yours of the 22d Decr. We shall all be

[234] Andrew Mitchell to David Hume, 15 August 1767, NLS Hume MSS 23156, no. 215.
[235] Clive Towse, 'Conway, Henry Seymour (1719-1795)', *ODNB*, at https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/6122, accessed 30 January 2018.

> afloat again, and now Dear sir pardon the Expression, As a Historian I have implicit faith in you, as a Philosopher I Revere you, but as a prophet I do not know in what class to Rank you. However as you do not seem intoxicated with your own skill in political divination, I will fairly tell you that I am extremely sorry that Mr Conway still persists in his resolution of quitting an office in which he is every way so well qualified, and to which he has done honour, besides I shall by his Retreat be deprived of your correspondence which I have ever highly valued. Upon the whole I most heartily wish that what is done, and doing, may turn out for the ease and advantage of His Majesty's Government.
>
> What Sir A. Forbes told you of my Intention is very fine but I have since altered my Plan. My Health was bad when I left England, and I had some anxiety of Mind about my Re-election into Parlt, the first is much mended, and the last is happily secured, so that I am not at present desirous of Returning, besides I have other Reasons which I can not now write but shall freely Communicate to you at Meeting. …
>
> … Every letter I have from Ld Marshall contains Compliments to you, He is well but does not come to Berlin to keep free from the fatigue of Courts. I shall not fail to make your Compliments to Him and to acquaint him with your Resolution, which however beneficial it may be to our History, is to me a real Affliction.[236]

Mitchell, as can be seen, took a gentle swipe at Hume's political foresight: only a month prior Hume had apparently told him that the ministry, and Conway's position, seemed secure. Mitchell also lamented this change because he had also been recently pleading with Frederick to renew his close ties to Britain in a sort of 'Northern Alliance', suggested by Pitt, where Mitchell had conveyed to Frederick the ministry's firm safety and stability.[237] Mitchell let Hume know that he would not be returning to Britain soon, but hinted that he would hope to speak to Hume in person at some later stage. Mitchell was kept up to date by his correspondent William Strahan, bookseller and friend of Hume.

Strahan's letter to Mitchell in the Hume manuscripts in the National Library of Scotland gives Mitchell the current situation of British politics in relation to Wilkes 'with all possible impartiality'.[238] After a lengthy letter outlining Wilkes's return to London, his contested election win, and the public and political opinion on him, Strahan's letter ended with an update on Hume. This presumes that Mitchell both seeks an update on Hume, and that Strahan is aware of Mitchell's ongoing interest in Hume's work. It does,

---

[236] Andrew Mitchell to David Hume, 9 January 1768, NLS Hume MSS 23156, No. 42.
[237] Black, *Pitt the Elder*, pp. 267-268.
[238] William Strahan to Andrew Mitchell, 1 April 1768, NLS Hume MSS 23158, No. 47. The letter is quoted nearly at full length, in relation to Wilkes, in George Birkbeck Hill, ed, *Letters of David Hume to William Strahan* (Oxford, 1888), pp. 121-122.

however, highlight the distance Mitchell had from news and opinion at home, as Strahan updates Mitchell on the state of Hume's career. Strahan wrote that Hume had dined with him, and that

> His Reputation as an Historian and Philosopher rises all over Europe every day. He is now applying in good earnest to the Continuation of his History having collected very considerable Materials; he desired me to present his best Compliments to you. Dr Douglas was also of the Company and desires to be Respectfully remembered to you.[239]

Mitchell wrote again to Hume, in a letter co-written with the Earl Marischal from Berlin. Hume had kept something more of a correspondence with the Earl Marischal in Berlin, a fellow Scot, close friend of Mitchell, and old friend and military servant of Frederick. Marischal detailed his life at Potsdam to Hume, and lamented that he did not speak German, though he was learning some expressions.[240] In fact, many of Marischal's letters to Hume have been printed and show him to keep Hume very much up to date with opinion regarding Hume in Berlin and Potsdam.[241] Mitchell often visited the earl and was often the recipient or sender of British beers, cheeses, and fine clothing items. Marischal, in his paternal and elderly role as Hume's humorous scourge, writes in the fashion of many of his letters to Hume: light-hearted but with a lively wit. The first half of the letter is written by him, the second half by Mitchell. It is addressed to David Hume 'Fidei Difensor', as Marischal frequently labels him.[242] I quote it at length as, to the best of my knowledge, it has not been published before.

> [EM]: You was the good David once,[243] but now I take you to be an idle rogue, tho I endeavour to excuse you to Sir Andrew Mitchell who also cryes out against you still more than I do; I excuse you by saying you are now more busy in continuing your history than when you was employed in ministerial affairs, I pray God forgive this lye for I veryly believe your

---

[239] *Ibid.* 'Dr Douglas' is Rev. Dr. John Douglas, bishop of Salisbury. He wrote against Hume but later dined with him. See Ian Simpson Ross, 'Douglas, John (1721-1807)', *ODNB*, at https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/7908, accessed 30 January 2018.

[240] Earl Marischal to David Hume, 11 September 1764, NLS Hume MSS 23156, No. 105. Cf. Hume MSS [formerly] in the possession of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, Australian National University Microfilm, Volume Reel VI, Letter 105, p. 83; Earl Marischal to David Hume, 29 April 1766, NLS Hume MSS 23156, No. 114. Cf. Hume MSS [formerly] in the possession of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, Australian National University Microfilm, Volume Reel VI, Letter 114, p. 85.

[241] John Hill Burton, ed, *Letters of Eminent Persons addressed to David Hume* (Edinburgh and London, 1849), pp. 57-71.

[242] The repeated references appear to be light-hearted jokes, such as when Hume prepared to leave Paris in 1765. Marischal proclaims: '*Alabado sea Dios y la Virgen Santissima,* who have set again at philosophic liberty the D—r of the f—th'. See *Ibid.*, p. 67.

[243] A reference to Hume being known, primarily in France, as 'le bon David'. See Mossner, *Life of Hume*, pp. 4, and 252, where Marischal explicitly says 'To the highflyers you are therefore a sad Whig, to the Whigs an hidden Jacobite, and to reasonable men, *le bon David*, a lover of truth'.

Silence is from mere lazyness, or from your head running on French Ladys whose favorite you was from Mes Dames de France, to les filles de l'Opera. If you would come to Holland an easy journy, and from thence to Hamburg still easier, I would meet you there and give you many anecdotes with truth, in which you deal solely, at least to the best of your knowledge, and you are the only historian I ever saw who wrote so.

[AM]: Dear David I have undertaken a journey here,[244] in order to abuse you for your Laziness & and yet we can not help praising and forgiving you. We expect much from you, not by letters but in a nobler way, by which mankind will be instructed & improved. No man can better show the fatal Effects of prejudices, and no Nation ever stood in need of such Instruction, more than ours does at the present moment.

I have passed some days in great joy and pleasure with Ld Marshall, who is perfectly well, every day you are mentioned with marks of Resentment and Affection by us both, pray give us some acct of what you are doing? And of what you intend to do? For my own part I am almost tired of doing nothing, but I fear I should do worse at Home. In the mean time accept of my most hearty wishes for your prosperity and happiness. My Lord will say the rest better than I can, only do not believe that His Lop. is less angry with you than I am, nor more willing to forgive. We are both every faithfully yours. My best compliments to Mr Stuart and Don Juan, I thank him for the pease and other seeds.[245]

The letter has a number of points that go towards establishing Mitchell as a familiar friend of Hume. For one, he writes with a very warm familiarity that, even with his older friends, such as Murdoch, Pringle, or Millar, he does not exhibit elsewhere. It is, secondly, very supportive of Hume's talents – openly and unabashedly so – and offers also a frank reflection on Mitchell's place and occupation in Berlin, and the prospects of meaningful employment (thin, as he sees them) at home. Finally, and most instructively, it showed Mitchell as a kindred spirit of Hume in the improvement of man. 'We expect much from you', Mitchell had written, 'not by letters but in a nobler way, by which mankind will be instructed and improved'.

Mitchell was later a subject of contemplation for Hume, if only briefly, and appears in a letter to William Strahan, lamenting Mitchell's death. Strahan had written to Hume prior to this letter, condoling with Hume over Mitchell's death. Strahan had written of his belief that Mitchell had stayed too long at a court where he was unhappy, and that Frederick was a 'Scoundrel' for neglecting his greatest diplomatic servant in such a way. 'I wish most heartily he had come to Britain, and enjoyed himself a few Years;',

[244] To Marischal's residence at San Souci.
[245] Andrew Mitchell and Lord Marischal to David Hume, 11 June 1768, Hume MSS 23158, No. 219-221. 'Mr Stuart' is probably Andrew Stuart, Scottish lawyer and politician. See Tristram Clarke, 'Stuart, Andrew (1725-1801)', *ODNB*, at https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/26693, accessed 30 January 2018.

Strahan wrote, 'for I have reason to think he was not very happy at Berlin for some years past'.[246] Like Strahan, Hume's judgement in reply was that he believed Mitchell was too good for Frederick.

> I very much regret with you Sir Andrew Mitchels Death: He was a worthy, well-bred, agreeable man. If the Prince, at whose Court he resided, us'd him ill of late Years, he richly deserves the Epithet you give him. Sir Andrew's chief Fault was his too great Attachment to that prince.[247]

b. Frederick on Hume, Hume on Frederick

Frederick told the Duchess of Saxe-Gotha in 1760 that he had read Hume, and said he thought Hume looked too much for paradoxes, which led him to contradictions. He told the Duchess that, in his opinion, Hume 'whips Christian religion on the buttocks of Mahometanism, and everywhere he says too much, or too little'.[248] Frederick added that he felt Hume drew too much from Locke, and that 'the modern author does not add to the old. On the contrary, it seems that Locke lends crutches to Mr. Hume to help him drag himself to a country where the ground seems to constantly crawl under his feet'.[249] He also wrote to d'Alembert sometime quite later (1773) that he felt Hume could 'not enter into parallel with Lord Bolingbroke'.[250] It should also be added that Frederick invited Rousseau to Berlin, which the philosopher was on the verge of accepting when Hume invited him to England.[251]

As noted above, when Hume wrote to Strahan on the death of Andrew Mitchell, Hume held no affection for Frederick either. But neither did he scorn him. In a different letter to Benjamin Franklin in 1762 he merely made the observation that, given the calamity and upheaval in Neuchatel over Rousseau's comments, neither the Lord Marischal George Keith, nor Frederick the Great, would pay much attention to a religious schism. Hume said that Marischal

---

[246] William Strahan to David Hume, early 1771 (undated), cf. Hill, *Letters of David Hume to William Strahan*, p. 181n26.
[247] David Hume to William Strahan, 11 March 1771, in Greig, ed, *The Letters of David Hume*, Vol. 2, p. 238. The epithet given Frederick by Strahan was 'Mayhap there never existed a greater scoundrel'. See George Birkbeck Hill, ed, *Letters of David Hume*, p. 181n26.
[248] Frederick to the Duchess of Saxe-Gotha, 8 May 1760, *Oeuvres*, Vol. 18. The French: il fouette la religion chrétienne sur les fesses du mahométanisme, et partout il en dit ou trop, ou trop peu. Frederick speaks there of Hume's *Natural History of Religion*, translated from French in 1759.
[249] *Ibid.* The French: mais l'auteur moderne ne renchérit pas sur l'ancien. Au contraire, il paraît que Locke prête des béquilles à M. Hume pour l'aider à se traîner dans un pays où le terrain semble sans cesse se dérober sous ses pieds.
[250] Frederick to d'Alembert, 28 January 1773, *Oeuvres*, Vol. 24.
[251] When Rousseau chose England over Berlin, his disgruntled former friend Frédéric Guillaume de Montmollin had to write apologetically to Frederick in Prussia on Rousseau's behalf. See Damrosch, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, pp. 403-404.

> told me, when in England, that the King of Prussia could not at first be brought to regard this theological Controversy as a Matter of any Moment, but soon found from the Confusions, to which it gave rise, that these were not matters to be slighted. But surely, never was a Synod of Divines more ridiculous, than to be worrying one another, under the Arbitration of the King of Prussia and Lord Marischal, who will make an Objection of every thing, that appears to these holy Men so deserving of Zeal, Passion, and Animosity.[252]

c. Mitchell, Hume, Frederick and Rousseau: Brief interactions

The fame of Jean-Jacques Rousseau was widespread by the 1760s. Not welcome in France, and having fallen out with the authorities in Geneva, Rousseau was offered the chance to move under the protection of Frederick of Prussia, where he could be housed in Neuchâtel, the principality ruled by Frederick. Conjecture began to arise as to where the best home was for Rousseau, whom Marischal and Hume both admired and wished to be protected. Frederick, it seems, was of two minds on Rousseau: on the one hand, he respected his powers, but on the other, thought him dangerous and volatile.

Frederick's most recent and authoritative biographer, Tim Blanning, has discussed Frederick's position on Rousseau: while he pitied him and offered him sanctuary, he did not subscribe to Rousseau's views and thought Rousseau, though not in so many words, was mentally unstable. Rousseau himself confessed that while he would have been free from religious persecution in Prussia, he was averse to what he saw as Frederick's 'disrespect for both natural law and human obligation'.[253] Although campaigning at this time, Frederick told Marischal to grant Rousseau asylum, writing 'we ought to give relief to this poor, unfortunate creature, whose only sin is to have strange opinions which he thinks are good'.[254]

When the Lord Marischal, George Keith, resident at Sans-Souci, and friend of Frederick, returned to Scotland for a time in 1763, Frederick showed his awareness of Marischal's friendship with Rousseau. For sometime he had been Governor of Neuchâtel, under the rule of Frederick, and had cultivated Rousseau's friendship when he arrived there in 1762. This must have been known to Frederick. 'It is said that Jean-Jacques will not follow you [to Scotland], so that your Scots will not see the Helvetic savage; it is not much of a pity, and M. Hume will compensate you a hundredfold for what you might lose to the society of Jean-Jacques'.[255] This quote not only demonstrates Frederick's awareness of Hume's position as a leading

---

[252] David Hume to Benjamin Franklin, 10 May 1762, 'Founders Online' at https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Franklin/01-10-02-0043, accessed 12 July 2018.
[253] Blanning, *Frederick the Great*, pp. 326-329.
[254] *Ibid.*
[255] Frederick to Lord Marischal, 4 September 1763 (incorrectly dated 1762), *Oeuvres*, Vol. 20. In this letter Frederick also laments the recent departure of d'Alembert, something which Mitchell was also closely scrutinising. D'Alembert later wrote his *Eloge de Milord Marechal* (Paris, 1779) after spending time with him during 1763, and written after Marechal's death in 1779. In this *Eloge*, d'Alembert noted that Mitchell was 'one of the men whom Milord Marechal

British philosopher, it also confirms Frederick's sentiment about Rousseau, an identical one to that expressed by Hume in a letter to the Comtesse de Boufflers. That is, Rousseau was not welcome in Neuchâtel, Hume wrote, and he refused the protection of Frederick of Prussia. 'At the same time', Hume wrote, 'both Lord Marischal and M. Rousseau speak very doubtfully of any intention which the latter may have, of seeking his retreat in this island'.[256] The Lord Marischal was one of Rousseau's patrons and supporters, and Rousseau said 'I called him father, and he called me son'.[257]

Rousseau ended his stay at Neuchâtel in 1765, but before leaving, rejected an annuity and further assistance from Frederick, writing, 'you wish to give me bread. Is there not one of your subjects who needs it?'.[258] Ultimately, despite later calling him a 'lunatic', Frederick felt pity for Rousseau rather than respect.[259] In a letter to Rousseau in 1765, Hume confirmed that their 'mutual friend' Marischal had put them in touch, and that Hume would continue this new correspondence.[260]

How does Mitchell play a part in this brief section? Mitchell's own patronage intersected with that of Hume quite briefly, but rather interestingly, and this subject might briefly be drawn out here to clarify this connection. On his return to London in 1764, Mitchell had brought with him Heinrich Füssli, better known now as Henry Fuseli, the famous artist and writer. At the express wishes of Sulzer, Mitchell had brought Fuseli to London, and set him up in a patronage circle that included the influential banker James Coutts, and Mitchell's milieu including Andrew Millar, John Armstrong, Patrick Murdoch, and the painter Allan Ramsay.[261] Fuseli was supplied with dictionaries and grammar editions by Millar at Mitchell's expense. With the help of these eminent men Fuseli made good progress in society.

Fuseli soon put his new linguistic skills to use in attacking Hume for his alleged malicious treatment of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. While Hume had brought Rousseau to England, the relationship had turned to suspicion on the part of Rousseau, and Fuseli had written in Rousseau's defence. Suspecting at first that Laurence Sterne had written the pamphlet, Hume realised that it was 'one Fuseli, an Engraver. He is a

---

loved most, and whom he regretted more … sent from England to the court of Berlin, a man of great wit and merit, and whom the King of Prussia honoured with a distinguished esteem'. See *Eloge*, p. 60n18.

[256] Hume to Comtesse de Boufflers, 3 July 1763, in Greig, eg, *Letters*, Vol. 1, p. 389.

[257] Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Confessions*, Book 12, at http://knarf.english.upenn.edu/Rousseau/conf12.html, accessed 11 July 2018.

[258] Blanning, *Frederick the Great*, pp. 326-329.

[259] *Ibid.*

[260] Hume to Rousseau, 22 October 1765, in Greig, ed, *Letters*, Vol. 1, p. 525.

[261] Soon after his arrival in London Mitchell reported to Burnet that he could report on Fuseli's good health to Sulzer. See Andrew Mitchell to Alexander Burnet, 8 February 1765, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Bundle 82. He continued to report back to Sulzer through Burnet throughout 1765. See letters in Bundle 82 of 8 March 1765, 13 December 1765, and 20 December 1765, in the latter where Mitchell advanced Fuseli ninety-two pounds for his forthcoming European trip with Lord Waldegrave's eldest son, Viscount Chewton. Some of the milieu is reported in Greig, ed, *The Letters of David Hume*, Vol. 2, p. 136. For the letter noting Fuseli's introduction to Ramsay, see Patrick Murdoch to Andrew Mitchell, 12 June 1764, BL Add MS 6840, f. 62.

fanatical admirer of Rousseau, but owns he was in the wrong to me'.[262] It was a neat little intersection but one that Hume did attribute negatively to Mitchell.[263]

When Mitchell took Fuseli to England, could he have known that the ambitious young Swiss would wade into the Hume-Rousseau debate? It is unlikely that this was on Fuseli's agenda when the pair reached London in 1764, for Fuseli did not write against Hume until 1767.[264] Horace Walpole did much to cement the end of the ill-fated excursion of Rousseau to England, when he published a letter that he had written, in which he purported to be Frederick of Prussia. It demonstrated a wider awareness of Rousseau's past, his connection to Frederick, and the distant links back to Hume and Britain. Impersonating Frederick, Walpole wrote: 'If you persist in racking your brains to find new misfortunes, choose any that you like; I am a king and can procure them according to your wishes. And as will never happen with your enemies, I will stop persecuting you when you stop glorying in persecution'.[265] The public immediately suspected Walpole as their author but Hume neither held it against him nor regretted the sentiments it contained.[266] The statement was not totally removed from Frederick's real sentiments on Rousseau, elaborated above.

iv. Mitchell and the state of German literature in the mid-eighteenth century

Andrew Mitchell's place in considerations of Anglo-German literary exchange has not been fully explored by historians. This is not to say that Prussian, British, and indeed broader German-British connections have not been explored, as the literature on this is vast and varied according to sub-genre. However, considering Andrew Mitchell's unique place at the court of Frederick the Great, and the role that diplomacy played in their relationship, it is critical to examine the intersections of Mitchell's activities in more depth. What literature and literary connections did Mitchell facilitate, and why? What was Frederick's view of this facilitation, if he held one at all? What implications did this have for German literature in a direct sense, and did it have any lingering effect? There is no evidence that Mitchell directly promoted English literature as such, or that he gave English books to his German friends which might have influenced their genre. Rather, this part of the chapter will show Andrew Mitchell to have played a key role in a series of meetings introducing Prussian and other German authors to Frederick. In explores literary 'exchanges' in terms of a

[262] David Hume to Hugh Blair, 20 May 1767, in Greig, ed, *The Letters of David Hume*, Vol. 2, p. 136. The letter suspecting Sterne is David Hume to Richard Davenport, 27 April 1767, in Raymond Klibansky and Ernest C. Mossner, eds, *New letters of David Hume* (Oxford, 1954), p. 160.
[263] As far as I can ascertain, Mitchell lost all contact with Fuseli after the former left Britain to return to Berlin. He was kept abreast of Fuseli's movements and progress by friends, but, so far as can be ascertained, never remained a cultural link to Fuseli or Germany in any way.
[264] The frontispiece to Fuseli's *Remarks on the Writings and Conduct of J. J. Rousseau* (London, 1767) shows Rousseau holding a measure of truth, and point to Voltaire, who rides on the back of a man wildly chewing grass, while Liberty and Justice are hanged above them. See Martin Myrone, *Bodybuilding: Reforming masculinities in British art 1750-1810* (New Haven and London, 2005), pp. 164-165.
[265] Damrosch, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, p. 420.
[266] James Fieser, ed, *Early responses to Hume's life and reputation*, rev. 2nd ed, Vol. 1 (Bristol, 2003), p. 154.

cultural exchange, or, more specifically, in terms of Mitchell's British influence on Frederick in the early part of his diplomatic mission, which in turn, in some ways, assisted Prussian and German literature. Mitchell's role in this has been briefly mentioned in the last English work covering his time in Prussia, Patrick Doran's *Andrew Mitchell and Anglo-Prussian relations during the Seven Years' War*. However, Doran's work was concerned with Mitchell's handling of British diplomacy in Prussia during the war, the politics of Britain, and the events of the war itself. Doran spends less than a page on Mitchell's involvement with German authors like Gellert and Gottsched, and only in the context of the situation of the war and Frederick's winter quarters at Leipzig in 1760-61.[267] Thomas Carlyle, in his biography of Frederick, also notes Mitchell exchanging witty repartee with Gottsched on the subject of Aristotle and literature, but again, anecdotally and all too briefly.[268]

Indeed, English-language work on Mitchell's involvement with German literature is limited. German-language coverage of these issues has been more thorough, particularly because of Frederick's long-stated position on German literature detailed in *An Essay on German Literature* (1780). Frederick's essay was a clear statement of his thoughts on German literature as it stood at 1780. Whether or not he was correct in his arguments is a matter of subjectivity, but contemporary German authors might have felt that Frederick's position had long been clear. Frederick's main concerns were with the prevalence of dialect which, to his mind, drained German of any purity or canon of words. 'In Germany,' he wrote, 'I find a half-barbarous language, which is divided into as many different dialects as the empire contains provinces'. He added that 'I listen to a jargon void of charms…'.[269] He identified that not only purity but perspicuity was wanting in German, and that although war had held it back, it was now in a time of peace where education should be improved to include better instruction on classical authors in Latin and Greek.[270] Frederick, however, was not against German language or literature – he merely sought to improve the sound and clarity of the language, and to write in a style more akin to classical or pre-eighteenth-century French authors whose styling he most adored. He admitted admiring few individual authors, and did not mention his enjoyment of Gellert, for example, whom Mitchell had introduced to him in Leipzig in the winter of 1760-61 (more on this below). 'These summer days of our literature are not yet come; but they approach; I foretell they will appear', Frederick wrote. 'I shall not see them; of the hope of this I am deprived by old age'.[271] But had they already come? As will be shown below, modern authors have argued that, indeed, Frederick had missed the first flourishings of German literature in the eighteenth century. While Mitchell himself might not have alerted Frederick to German publications (if indeed he knew of them or read them in original language), he certainly knew how to make connections with authors and learned men and to grow

[267] Doran, *Andrew Mitchell*, pp. 285-286.
[268] Carlyle, *History of Friedrich II. of Prussia*, Vol. 5, p. 540.
[269] Frederick II of Prussia, 'An Essay on German Literature', in *Posthumous Works of Frederic II. King of Prussia*, Vol. 13, *Letters between Frederic II. The Prince of Prussia, and General Fouquet. Miscellanies.* trans. Thomas Holcroft (London, 1789), pp. 401-403.
[270] *Ibid.*, pp. 410-411.
[271] *Ibid.*, p. 457.

these connections. Mitchell's language, and indeed Mitchell himself, in a small way, contributed to the further development of German literature.

Grundolf has observed that Frederick's arguments, aims and pleas were made almost entirely in ignorance of the German literature that had grown and changed around him since his time as a precocious young *philosophe* at Rheinsberg in the 1740s. 'With good common sense', Grundolf writes, 'he advanced perfectly plausible rules – which were invalidated only by the fact that they were unnecessary'.[272] Earlier writers also noted Frederick's ignorance of the swelling ability of German literati, but also their work itself. Thomas Campbell believed that 'when, some years after his accession, a brighter era for German literature began to dawn, the king was too much engrossed by the cares of government and by wars, to pay attention to its productions'.[273] Recently, Tim Blanning has noted that Frederick might have refrained from taking too active a part in promoting his country's writers and literati due to 'the thought that his relationship with [them] had been at best tangential and at worst hostile'.[274]

Those literary figures who flourished in the time of Frederick the Great thus had no great patron, with the possible exception of the patron Friedrich Nicolai, the printer and bookseller of many of the most illustrious German writers and one extremely familiar with English literature.[275] Those writers internalised their growth, absorbing writings from around Europe – with strong attention to British writers – and founded their own outlets for their writing through periodicals, and their own publishing structures. Thus, the German writers were finding their way through despite Frederick's ignorance. It would be unreasonable to say that Mitchell provided a large spur to their efforts, but Mitchell as a focal point is hard to deny, particularly given the evidence for his involvement in German literature.

Accurate translations, particularly of English language works, could be obtained in Prussia by mid-century, although with difficulty. Some German language scholars, such as Johann Christoph Gottsched and his wife Luise, had been working on translations of items like *The Spectator* from the 1730s, and had made great advances in the sophistication of translations.[276] A large translation of Alexander Pope's works, overseen by Nicolai, became available in the early 1760s when the English language was becoming more popular and ambitions spread to reprinting in translation the greatest English language writers.[277] As Bernhard Fabian has noted, the second half of the eighteenth century was a boom time for English language publications in Germany. For Fabian, English language printing in Germany was not just business, but also

[272] Friedrich Grundolf, 'Frederick's essay on German literature', in Peter Paret, ed, *Frederick the Great: A profile* (London and Basingstoke, 1972), p. 215.
[273] Campbell, *Frederick the Great*, Vol. 2, p. 307.
[274] T. C. W. Blanning, 'Frederick the Great and German culture', in Robert Oresko, G. C. Gibbs, and H. M. Scott, eds, *Royal and republican sovereignty*, p. 528.
[275] Bernhard Fabian, 'Nicolai und England' in Fabian, *Selecta Anglicana*, pp. 195-215.
[276] Hilary Brown, *Luise Gottsched the translator* (Rochester, NY, 2012), pp. 85-88.
[277] J. H. Heinzelmann, 'Pope in Germany in the eighteenth century', *Modern Philology*, 10 (1913), p. 346.

'an act of cultural self-help'.[278] It was not only interest, as some have noted, but also necessity, and while Germans in 1700 could flourish without English, by the end of the eighteenth century knowledge of it was indispensable.[279]

The writers who are considered to form part of the core of major German writers, such as Lessing and Goethe, were often as vocal about a lack of rigorous German language refinement (when it came to literature) as Frederick had been. The difference was that they were taking matters into their hands, while Frederick had, in their minds, done little to encourage a change in this regard, preferring to place his complaints in print. These complexities have been further explored by Katrin Kohl, who also argues that the poets and writers used Frederick's neglect as a means to spur an internally-motivated literary growth. Further, Kohl notes, Frederick's failure to support German writers was turned into 'productive neglect', something Goethe explicitly stated.[280] As Lessing also pronounced in 1767, he was still looking for the German city that would be a home to the poets as Calais had been to the French poet and dramatist Pierre-Laurent Buirette de Belloy.[281]

If they could find no local patron to assist in the development of a literary career, it was possible for German authors to look elsewhere. This is precisely what occurred with Andrew Mitchell when Gotthold Ephraim Lessing's network of friends wanted to find him work that would assist in the growth of his career and provide a level of financial security. Mitchell's entry into learned Berlin circles certainly did much to place him among that society as a man of learning, intelligence, and resources. He also came to be seen as a possible channel for patronage, and as a conduit for German connections to Britain. As noted previously in this thesis, Euler certainly saw Mitchell as a very useful new link in his network. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, the poet, author, and pillar of the German Enlightenment, was linked to Mitchell in a number of ways and not in a one-sided way. Jonathan Israel argues that Lessing was in fact the outstanding member of the *Radical* Enlightenment, who along with and on behalf of his friend Moses Mendelssohn, aimed to 'ameliorate human life by creating a culture of investigation, criticism, and debate fired by 'reason', robust enough to purge humanity of prejudicial older ideas via the force of public criticism and controversy.' Israel sees Lessing as 'Germany's foremost champion of full toleration and freedom of thought.'[282] His most recent biographer Hugh Barr Nisbet argues that, in his lifetime, Lessing was not only

---

[278] Bernhard Fabian, 'The beginnings of the English-language publishing in Germany in the eighteenth century', in Kenneth E. Carpenter, ed, *Books and society in history: Papers of the Association of College and Research Libraries Rare Books and Manuscripts preconference* (New York and London, 1983), p. 129.
[279] R. J. Roberts, 'Towards a short-title catalogue of English eighteenth century books', *Journal of Librarianship*, 2 (1970), p. 251. The strong literary connection had grown considerably during the eighteenth century and had notably grown at the time coinciding with Mitchell's tenure in Prussia. See Hilary Brown, *Benedikte Naubert (1756-1819) and her relations to English culture* (London, 2005), pp. 6-10.
[280] Katrin Kohl, 'Hero or villain? The response of German authors to Frederick the Great', *Publications of the English Goethe Society*, 81 (2012), pp. 51-72.
[281] Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, ed. Friedrich Schröter and Richard Thiele (Halle, 1877), p. 115. Note 24 on this page explains how de Belloy was given his citizenship of Calais in a golden capsule with a laudatory Latin inscription.
[282] Jonathan Israel, *Democratic Enlightenment: Philosophy, Revolution, and Human Rights 1750-1790* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 192-193.

Germany's leading writer but also the figure best representative of the spirit of the German Enlightenment.[283]

In the carnage of the Seven Years' War, however, Lessing, like many intellectuals, found himself hampered by the situation across Germany and Europe. Though he was proficient with English and had in fact engaged with a number of prominent English works, including writing a preface to the tragedies of James Thomson (Mitchell's former close friend, now dead),[284] Lessing's friends, the poets Ewald Christian von Kleist and Johann Wilhelm Ludwig Gleim, recognised in Lessing the potential for greater work, but needing, in the short term, a paying job.[285] Kleist and Gleim shopped Lessing around for various opportunities, doing 'everything' to get him a job in Berlin, even going so far as to promote his character, manners, and looks to Prince Henry's equerry Christian Ludwig von Brandt when the Prince's secretary died.[286] Kleist and Gleim also floated Lessing as a possible royal librarian, as a private tutor for Frederick's brother Prince August Ferdinand, or most importantly for this investigation, as a secretary to Andrew Mitchell.[287] Kleist believed Mitchell to be on the lookout for a German secretary, and wondered to von Brandt whether he might suggest 'the brave and very clever Lessing' for this post.[288] Though no word of Mitchell's consent either way is apparent, Kleist's hopes were dashed less than a month later when he wrote that 'it is a pity, that the Secretary of Embassy of Mr. Mitchel is not yet a little sick, that Mr Lessing could have taken this position.'[289] The case for Lessing becoming Mitchell's secretary had many mutual benefits: Mitchell the scientific and literary promoter and facilitator, working alongside a professed Anglophile in Lessing, proficient in the language, with a strong interest in English literature and the ability to produce works heavily influenced by English settings and linguistic turns of phrase.[290] Mitchell was also the focal point for English visitors in Prussia, usually on a Grand Tour, who brought the latest news from home.[291] This may have been an additional appeal for local Prussian intellects.

It was not only Lessing, Gleim and Kleist who were aware of Mitchell's cultural and social worth. The cross-cultural interest of Prussians in English language and literature brought Mitchell firmly into the view of other German learned figures associated with literature, and Frederick's court. Ernst Ahasverus von Lehndorff, Chamberlain to Frederick's wife, Queen Elisabeth Christine, had dined with Mitchell early in Mitchell's Prussian tenure and prided himself on speaking fully in English with Mitchell. Lehndorff

[283] Hugh Barr Nisbet, 'Lessing's achievement', in Ritchie Robertson, ed, *Lessing and the German Enlightenment* (Oxford, 2013), p. 3.
[284] F. Andrew Brown, *Gotthold Ephraim Lessing* (New York, 1971), p. 16.
[285] Nisbet, *Gotthold Ephraim Lessing*, p. 230.
[286] Erich Schmidt, *Lessing. Sein Leben und seine Schriften* (Hildesheim, Zürich and New York, 1983), p. 311.
[287] Hugh Barr Nisbet, *Lessing: Eine Biographie* (Munich, 2008), p. 306.
[288] Ewald Christian von Kleist to Christian Ludwig von Brandt, Leipzig, 27 May 1757, in Richard Daunicht, ed, *Lessing im Gespräch. Berichte und Urteile von Freunden und Zeitgenossen* (München, 1971), p. 118.
[289] Kleist to von Brandt, Leipzig, 18 June 1757, in *Ibid.*, p. 119.
[290] Ritchie Robertson, 'Preface', in Robertson, ed, *Lessing*, p. xi.
[291] For example the visit of James Boswell in 1764 and James Harris in 1767.

commented that it 'excites me anew to learn the language of a nation that I love so greatly'.[292] Lehndorff was also aware that, as a senior courtier, his socialising with Mitchell would certainly tease and irritate the French community of the court.[293] Lehndorff continued to find many Englishmen using Mitchell's house as a focal point for their gatherings, where Lehndorff observed almost none who he thought were worthy to be there.[294] The linguistic exchanges also occurred in the opposite direction; Mitchell practised his German with Gottsched, with whom he debated the merits of literary composition and, according to an anecdote related by Thomas Carlyle, put a quick end to Gottsched's pretensions to English dramatic composition. Talking of Shakespeare, as Carlyle recounts, Gottsched put forth his argument to which Mitchell then countered. It begins with Gottsched:

> 'Genial, if you will,' said Gottsched, 'but the Laws of Aristotle; Five Acts, unities strict!' – 'Aristotle? What is to hinder a man from making his Tragedy in Ten acts, if it suit him better?' 'Impossible, your Excellency' – 'Pooh', said his Excellency; 'suppose Aristotle, and general Fashion too, had ordered that the clothes of every man were to be cut from five ells of cloth: how would the Herr Professor like [with these huge limbs of his] if he found there were no breeches for him, on Aristotle's account?' Adieu to Gottsched; most voluminous of men…[295]

Returning to Lessing briefly allows some context to be drawn out for the state of German literature during the period of Mitchell's tenure, and what his later intervention on behalf of German authors might have meant for their progress. It was noted above that German authors had recognised the need to take matters into their own hands if they were going to make progress. For Lessing, engagement with English literature had been something of a necessity, as Nisbet outlines the financial hardships he faced which led him to produce translations, some far from his taste and interests, in order to support himself.[296] Still, the impact of Lessing was enormous, and the argument has been made that his critical faculties put German literature on a European level.[297] The internal battle of the German authors was also being monitored by Frederick. He noted on numerous occasions Germany's place at the dawn of a great age of literary development,

---

[292] Wieland Giebel, ed, *Die Tagebücher des Grafen Lehndorff: die geheimen Aufzeichnungen des Kammerherrn der Königin Elisabeth Christine* (Berlin, 2007), p. 315.
[293] Lehndorff diary entry, 8 May 1756, in *Dreißig Jahre*, p. 270.
[294] *Ibid.*, 13-17 September 1756, p. 303.
[295] Carlyle, *Friedrich II. of Prussia*, Vol. V, p. 540. Gottsched had also debated German grammar, spelling, and pronunciation with Frederick in Leipzig in the previous days and weeks. See this publication, pp. 538-539. This story is recounted slightly more elaborately, and earlier, in Friedrich Nicolai, ed, *Anekdoten von Friedrich II. von Preussen, und von einigen Personen, die um Ihn waren*, Vol. 3 (Berlin and Stettin, 1790), pp. 288-290.
[296] Nisbet, *Gotthold Ephraim Lessing: His life*, p. 225. Lessing's search for a job was taking place as Pringle and Franklin made their tour through Göttingen, and Nisbet speculates that they may have met. See Nisbet, *Lessing: Eine biographie*, p. 438.
[297] 'Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim', in Henry and Mary Garland, *The Oxford companion to German literature* (Oxford, 1976), p. 527.

which needed but the right people and the right publications to bring it to fruition.[298] This has been disputed by Blanning, who sees Frederick as absolutely denying any sense of progress in German literature, and categorically places him as a cultural conservative whose subjects had far overtaken him in all the arts.[299] Several important factors supported the idea that Frederick's ignorance allowed German authors not only to flourish, but to work competitively among themselves for his regard and for their own reputations.[300] One thing that some noted was what may have become of German literature if Frederick had not only spoken better German, but if he had published in that language. They felt that, with him as their patron, they might have evolved quicker, and more fully. Perhaps Mitchell recognised this in the context of his diplomatic situation.

v. Deconstructing Mitchell's motivations

The most difficult question to address in the context of Mitchell's involvement with German authors is to what extent it was a mere expression of personal interest, and to what extent it was reinforcing his diplomatic mission to encourage Frederick to look internally for cultural growth, rather than to France. Was encouraging German authors the same as discouraging French ones? A contemporary of Mitchell at Frederick's court – and one implicated closely in the cultural battle German authors were fighting for recognition from Frederick – gave expression to the idea of patronage as a form of cultural warfare in a rather simple way. Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock was among a number of those disappointed not to win Frederick's favour (Lessing and Wieland were among the others). Lessing turned to contempt and criticism; Klopstock looked to a near, and recent, enemy for support. Travelling to Austria to court the patronage of Joseph II, Klopstock claimed that 'The emperor loves his fatherland – but Frederick does not! And yet Germany is also his fatherland!'. Goethe expressed similar sentiments, and in addition to praising Frederick for his victory in the Seven Years' War (which for Goethe provided the impetus for creation of new literary material[301]), argued that Prussia's literary victory over Austria and Catholicism would complement its military one.[302] Goethe was also of the view that Frederick's victory had in addition given German literature a healthy dose of Francophobia.[303] As Tim Blanning has noted, we must be cautious about admitting a strong correlation between literary growth and military achievements. Yet many do seem to have subscribed

[298] MacDonogh, *Frederick the Great*, pp. 368-371.
[299] Blanning, *Frederick the Great*, pp. 343, 345.
[300] *Ibid.*, pp. 352-354.
[301] See for example Walter A. Kaufmann's point that, fascinated as a youth by Frederick's personality and his victories, Goethe might have put some of the flavour of Frederick's character into his *Faust*. See Walter A. Kaufmann, 'Goethe and the history of ideas', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 10 (1949), pp. 512-513.
[302] Blanning, *Culture of power*, pp. 215-216, 222.
[303] Blanning, 'Frederick the Great and German culture', p. 548.

to this view.[304] By the same token, Prussians of the period recognised that the rise of their literary talents was akin, in literary terms, to winning a long battle. As one man put it:

> it was under [Frederick's] nose that a powerful reaction began – the development of mighty German dramatic talents which led to the expulsion of foreign influence, without Frederick himself or any of those entrusted with the implementation of his policies having the slightest inkling of it.[305]

Leopold von Ranke also was keen to attribute much of Prussia philosophical and literary growth to the freedom from danger won by Frederick during the Seven Years' War, but as with other commentators, he took note of Frederick's ignorance (willing or unwilling). He attributed the flourishing of German literature under Frederick to 'a great national existence'.[306] If, as in Blanning's conclusion, Frederick's Prussia combined power with culture, then there is sense in allowing that Mitchell might have recognised that introducing German scholars to might have contributed to his diplomacy.[307] Certainly Mitchell's letters with fellow diplomat David Stormont (at that time in Ratisbon) on the subject of C. F. Gellert warrant this approach due to their existence within Mitchell's diplomatic papers.

Early on in Mitchell's mission, on the verge of the Diplomatic Revolution, Newcastle had reaffirmed to him that France was the object of their diplomatic machinations with Prussia, and that Frederick and the British might be made better friends by insinuation against France. 'We must see how to play our game with the cards we have', Newcastle had told Mitchell.[308] Newcastle added not much later that, at London, the French party 'brag of the King of Prussia's steady adherence to them', and that, at Berlin, the French believed that 'the King of Prussia and all the Court are Frenchmen'.[309] Of course it was in the interests of Mitchell and Britain to encourage discord between Frederick and France – this much is clear from even a cursory study of the war. Mitchell noted that Frederick, prior to the outbreak of war, did not want to lose the friendship of France, but was daily more insulted by them. 'This will naturally lead him to strengthen and extend his alliance with the King [of Britain], so that all that is wanted will be to encourage and improve this disposition in the King of Prussia as often as it shows itself'.[310] By 1759, Mitchell could confidently report to Pitt that he was overjoyed to hear 'his Prussian Majesty make the parallel between his former ally and his present, and the comparison between the behaviour of the French and English

[304] Blanning, *Culture of power*, p. 222.
[305] Achim von Arnim, cf. Blanning, *Culture of power*, p. 223.
[306] Blanning, 'Frederick the Great and German culture', p. 528.
[307] *Ibid.*, p. 550.
[308] Newcastle to Mitchell, 28 May 1756, in Bisset, *Memoirs*, Vol. 1, pp. 175-176.
[309] Newcastle to Mitchell, 9 July 1756, in *Ibid.*, p. 190.
[310] Mitchell to Holdernesse, 12 August 1756, in *Ibid.*, p. 194.

ministers'.[311] The problem was that Frederick showed a much weaker, almost non-existent, disposition towards German literature. Culturally, Frederick was Franco- rather than Anglophile but his Francophilia did not assist his political relationship with that kingdom. Thus his meetings with German authors might have piqued his interest rather than his cultural tastes – but they may also have been politically advantageous for Mitchell.

It was in his personal relationship with Frederick that Mitchell unarguably found the most fruitful means of influencing Frederick and convincing Frederick of the correctness of his advice. Mitchell spoke freely to the King when given the opportunity, or when seeing the necessity. Mitchell reported to Holdernesse in March 1760 that Frederick had given him a copy of his own *Oeuvres de Philosophe de Sans Souci*, and that they had spoken about it at length over dinner for the preceding week. It was not dissimilar to the discussions of literature that Mitchell had engaged in for much of his early career in London. Mitchell explained:

> For the Philosophe the next day asked my opinion and observing that I was shy & reserved upon the point, pressed and encouraged me to speak fairly, which I, not caring to dissemble, complyed with more easily as there are really more things to be admired than to be blamed in the book. I praised with decency and without exaggeration and blamed with freedom where I thought I was well founded, and this has afforded matter of Conversation for 5 or 6 days at Table, where only his Majesty was present…[312]

Mitchell concluded by telling Holdernesse that 'of all the authors I ever conversed with the Philosophe de Sans Souci bears criticism the best'.[313] Some of his predecessors had likewise found this frankness a productive way of communicating with Frederick and earning his respect. Melchior Guy Dickens and Thomas Villiers had both found Frederick responsive to plain speaking.[314] On numerous occasions Mitchell noted the tolerance Frederick showed when the British diplomat spoke or wrote to him frankly. He noted the fear of Frederick's ministers to tell him the truth, and added:

> I have been obliged to write with the greatest freedom [to Frederick], sometimes directly and sometimes by the canal of Count Finckenstein, narrating a conversation I have had with him. These, methinks, have hitherto succeeded. Everything has been done as was suggested, and I

[311] Mitchell to Pitt, 8 January 1759, in *Ibid.*, p. 168.
[312] Mitchell to Holdernesse, 30 March 1760, BL Add MS 58285, f. 163.
[313] *Ibid.*
[314] Bisset, *Memoirs*, Vol. 1, pp. 153-155.

> have been loaded with thanks; but I confess, my Lord, I tremble every time I am reduced to this necessity, from the knowledge I have of the party concerned.[315]

At the time of taking winter quarters in Leipzig, it is highly probable that Mitchell was at the peak of his influence and friendship with Frederick. This certainly seems to be true in light of Frederick's comment to Gottsched, in a 1757 meeting, that when it came to studying German or reading German books, he had 'no time for such things', and yet he allowed Mitchell this opportunity three years later, at arguably a more dire point in the war.[316] Frederick's epistle on good and evil, dedicated to Mitchell and given to him some time in late 1761, marked the end of that peak, prior to Britain's announcement of the end of the Prussian subsidy.[317] Throughout the previous years of campaigning Mitchell had sat many times at the king's table, and as noted in previous chapters, had spent much time in conversation with him. Matters would, from time to time, have covered literature, authors, and probably philosophy and music. Why then does Mitchell's step of orchestrating the introduction of German authors to Frederick seem so significant? As noted here, the dating of the meetings in 1760-61 fit with the arc of Mitchell's influence. In addition, and perhaps more importantly, Mitchell's criticisms of the advisors and ministers around Frederick was a main contributing factor to his taking this step. If they were timid in speaking with the King on important matters, then by Mitchell's reasoning, they were perhaps more culpable in allowing the King to ignore a cultural movement which might have given strength to the resolve of his beleaguered population.

The fundamental point here may be that Frederick was becoming a focal point for German authors both in terms of his heroic status but also the potential for him to further their careers through his interest in the promotion of cultured pursuits more generally. The Marquis d'Argens, Frederick's most trustworthy and loyal friend, had come to see the German language and German writers as offering great, but unrealised, potential. Exposure to German language and the writings of its authors had also allowed d'Argens to act independently of Frederick, affecting C. F. Gellert's entry to the Berlin Academy (after his meeting with Frederick) and promoting the careers of others such as Gottlieb Wilhelm Rabener.[318] The rise of Frederick as a subject of praise in literature made this time at Leipzig ripe for the advancement of domestic German culture, or perhaps for flattery to disguise this advancement. Johann Wilhelm Lugwig Gleim's collection of patriotic verse entitled *Kriegs- und Siegeslieder der Preußen von einem preußischen Grenadier* (*War and Victory-songs of the Prussians by a Prussian Grenadier*), published in 1758, had done much to raise Frederick to heroic status.[319] Frederick may also have been made aware of the high degree of public adulation for him in Britain, where everything from poems to inns were named after him.[320] Mitchell was also sure to communicate British

[315] Mitchell to Bute, 7 March 1762, in Bisset, *Memoirs*, Vol. 1, p. 152.
[316] Lawrence Venuti, *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*, 2nd ed. (London and New York, 2008), p. 88.
[317] Frederick II, 'Épitre a Monsieur Mitchell, sur l'origine du mal', *Oeuvres*, Vol. 12, pp. 224-232.
[318] Gasper, *Marquis d'Argens*, p. 227.
[319] Henry and Mary Garland, *German literature*, p. 285.
[320] Blanning, *Frederick the Great*, p. 348.

support for Frederick wherever possible, not only in a diplomatic sense but in a more broadly flattering sense. Mitchell and Frederick reciprocated this praise for person and for state.[321] Therefore, Mitchell must have felt confident that his introduction of authors to Frederick would be received with calm and interest.

vi. The meetings and their aftermath

The first we hear of a meeting between German authors and Frederick is Gottsched's meeting with Frederick in November 1757. The two debated the perceived harshness of German language, Gottsched's efforts to harmonise it, and Frederick's opinions on it.[322] While Mitchell was present here and debated Gottsched on Aristotle and Shakespeare (see above), he does not seem to have facilitated this meeting. Mitchell did, however, explicitly arrange the meetings in Leipzig in the winter of 1760-1761. Who was invited through Mitchell to meet the King? Christian Fürchtegott Gellert was to benefit the most from the meeting, but had published his *Fabeln und Erzählungen* (Fables and Stories), based on German stories from medieval times onward, quite some time previously, in 1746.[323] Frederick wrote the Duchess of Saxe-Gotha that 'for fun', he had 'reviewed all the professors of this university [at Leipzig]. I have found three or four filled with merit and good knowledge, among others, a Greek teacher who seemed to me to have more judgment and taste than is common to meet in the scholars of our nation'. Further, Frederick claimed that one, presumably Gottsched, would not have escaped the attention of Molière.[324] The others Frederick met included Johann August Ernesti, the rector of the Thomasschule in Leipzig and also a university theologian;[325] Johann Jacob Reiske, scholar of Arabic and Greek;[326] Johann Heinrich Winckler, a scholar of Hebrew better known for his physics and electricity work;[327] Carl Günther Ludovici, commercial scientist and professor at Leipzig;[328] and, later, Sulzer. It is possible that a number of these scholars were selected

[321] For examples of mutual praise, see Mitchell to Frederick, 18 September 1756, BL Add MS 58292, f. 27, and Mitchell to Pitt, 8 January 1759, BL Add MS 58292, f. 91r.
[322] Nicolai, ed, *Anekdoten*, Vol. 3, pp. 286-288.
[323] Henry and Mary Garland, *German literature*, p. 214.
[324] Frederick the Great to the Duchess of Saxe-Gotha, 12 January 1761, in *Oeuvres*, Vol. 18, *Correspondance de Frédéric II Roi de Prusse*, Vol. 3 (Berlin, 1851), pp. 193-194.
[325] Carol K. Baron, 'Transitions, transformations, reversals: Rethinking Bach's world', in Carol K. Baron, ed, *Bach's changing world: Voices in the community* (Rochester and Woodbridge, 2006), p. 26
[326] Hartmut Bobzin, 'Reiske, Johann Jacob', in *NDB*, at https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd100317278.html#ndbcontent, accessed 1 March 2018.

[327] Otto Liebmann, 'Winckler, Johann Heinrich', in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, 43 (1898), at https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd117582115.html#adbcontent, accessed 1 March 2018; J. L. Heilbron, *Elements of early modern physics* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1982), pp. 180-182.

[328] Peter Koch, 'Ludovici, Carl Günther', in *NDB*, at https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd117281387.html#ndbcontent, accessed 1 March 2018.

specifically to interest Frederick – Ludovici's open support for Christian Wolff, to whom Frederick was partial, would not have been lost on Frederick.[329]

The fact that Frederick played off the meetings as casual events 'for fun' can perhaps be understood in the context of his conception of himself as a philosopher, but also, his opinions about philosophy which did not sit perfectly within the interests of his contemporary subjects. Although Mitchell could speak candidly to the King, as noted above, he cautioned others to be careful in criticising Frederick. When Henri de Catt arrived to take up his post as Frederick's reader, Catt recalled that Mitchell gave him advice on how to best deal with Frederick's literary sensitivities.

> Without becoming too familiar with this Prince, be frank and open with him, and when you are together, always put forward points of literature, philosophy and especially metaphysics, which he loves very much. Start from the French poets, and if he shows you his verses, criticise only as much as he demands of you; put him in the position of talking rather than talking about yourself.[330]

As Patrick Doran has noted, 'these were, undoubtedly, Mitchell's own rules of behaviour'.[331] While he does not recommend outright flattery, Mitchell was certainly very clear about how best to handle conversations with Frederick, particularly those on literary and philosophical topics. In the sense of Mitchells words, it is then possible to interpret Frederick's explanation to the Duchess of Saxe-Gotha as his conception of the conversations, which may or may not have been based on the reality of the situation. There is no doubt Mitchell was central to the setting of the meetings. It was he and d'Argens, according to an important contemporary source, who 'awoke the desire of the monarch [Frederick] to personally meet the eminent Saxons Ernesti, Rabener, Gellert and Reiske. Through them also was our Sulzer better known to the King in the year 1761'.[332] While Frederick might not have been influenced by the ideas discussed, it is possible that Mitchell had explained to Gellert, and others, the best way to handle Frederick, in the way he had explained to Catt.

The choice to hold the meetings at Leipzig appears to have been purely out of convenience. Frederick had made winter quarters there after the Battle of Torgau on 3 November, 1760. He cantoned his men around the city and other areas of Saxony. However, as Katrin Löffler has noted, Leipzig can be

---

[329] Israel, *Democratic enlightenment*, p. 176.
[330] Catt, *Unterhaltungen*, p. 9. The French: Sans vous familiariser trop avec ce Prince, soyez cependant franc et ouvert avec lui, et quand vous serez les soirées ensemble, mettez toujours en avant des points de littérature, de philosophie et surtout de métaphysique, qu'il aime beaucoup; partez-lui des poètes français et s'il vous montre de ses vers, ne critiquez qu'autant qu'il l'exigera de vous; mettez [-le] dans le cas de parler plûtot que de parler vous-même.
[331] Doran, *Andrew Mitchell*, p. 204.
[332] *Hirzel an Gleim über Sulzer den Weltweisen*, Vol. 2, p. 21. See also Chapter 4 for a note of these events.

seen as the 'cultural centre of the enlightenment' in Germany at this time.[333] Also, it served to bring the war to Gellert's doorstep, which prompted him to make strong comments about war and peace to Frederick in their interview.[334] The content of the conversations that Frederick had with Gellert and other men – not all authors, as we have seen, but a mixture of teachers and associates of the Leipzig university – covered various topics. As we have seen, he seemed to enjoy challenging them on their particular areas of specialty. One contemporary account explains that Frederick 'asked each one questions, such as that fell into their area of science'. With Winkler he covered the study of nature, light, electricity, Newton and Euler; with Gottsched he spoke again of manuscripts in Leipzig and elsewhere, including in Vienna, said to be by Philipp Melancthon, and which had been used by Luther via Erasmus.[335] However, little evidence exists for Mitchell's involvement with these men in Leipzig in the winter of 1760-1761, except for Gellert, who tells us the most about Mitchell's involvement on his behalf.

a. Gellert, his reputation, and his interest in English literature

Gellert was one of the foremost promoters of the Samuel Richardson's novels. Gellert translated was inspired by *Pamela*, and had translated Richardson's *Sir Charles Grandison* in 1755,[336] and though he was not always a supporter of the novel form in general, he was also to try his hand at novel-writing in the form of his *Das Leben der schwedischen Gräfin von G**** (*The life of the Swedish countess of G*). Gellert was foremost among German writers on the topic of literary taste, but he himself believed Richardson to be his guiding star. The *Frankfurter gelehrten Anzeigen* (Frankfurt learned report) claimed that 'With our public, to believe in Gellert, virtue, and religion is almost one and the same thing'.[337] As for Gellert himself, has said of Richardson that 'Immortal is Homer, but among Christians the British Richardson is more immortal still'.[338] Gellert's enthusiasm for Richardson, on one occasion, led him one morning to read the latter's *Sir Charles Grandison* rather than his usual sermon by John Tillotson.[339] He was not alone in his admiration for Richardson. Johann Gottfried Herder noted that Richardson's three novels had had a 'golden age' in Germany, and lamented the absence of German equivalents of Shakespeare, Swift, Addison, Fielding and Sterne.[340]

---

[333] Katrin Löffler, *Anthropologische Konzeptionen in der Literatur der Aufklärung: Autoren in Leipzig 1730-1760* (Leipzig, 2005), p. 16.
[334] Bernd Witte, 'Der Dichter und der Kriegsherr', in Sibylle Schönborn and Vera Viehöver, eds, *Gellert und die empfindsame Aufklärung: Vermittlungs-, Austausch- und Rezeptionsprozesse in Wissenschaft, Kunst und Kultur* (Berlin, 2009), p. 80.
[335] Christian Friedrich Hempel and Johann Friedrich Seyfart, *Helden- Staats- und Lebensgeschichte des Allerdurchlauchtigsten, und Grosmächtigsten Fürsten und Herrn, Friedrichs des Andern*, Vol. 6 (Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1762), p. 596.
[336] Both these points noted in Norbert Schürrer, 'Transnational print trade relations', in Peter Sabor and Betty A. Schellenberg, eds, *Samuel Richardson in context* (Cambridge, 2017), p. 94.
[337] Christa Baguss Britt, 'Critical introduction and textual history', in Sophie von LaRoche, *The history of Lady Sophia Sternheim*, trans. and critical introduction Christa Baguss Britt (Albany, 1991), p. 14.
[338] *Ibid.*
[339] Sylvia Kasey Marks, *Sir Charles Grandison: The compleat conduct book* (Lewisburg, London and Toronto, 1986), p. 17.
[340] Oppel, *English-deutsche Literaturbeziehungen*, p. 126.

Mitchell had of course been a 'trier' for Andrew Millar and had advised him, as we saw in Chapter 2, on the quality of prospective novels to be published, such as advising him against publishing Henry Fielding's *Amelia*, which Mitchell judged inferior to the widely celebrated *Tom Jones* by the same author.[341] Now it can be seen that Mitchell and Gellert certainly would have bonded over Richardson and, likely, other British writers. Indeed, just as Mitchell might have compared *Pamela* to *Clarissa*, so had German readers done the same. Further, Gellert was hand-selected to translate Richardson's *Sir Charles Grandison* in 1755.[342] On that occasion, Richardson's German publisher Philipp Erasmus Reich commented to Richardson of his *Sir Charles Grandison* that 'you had the goodness to send me the first copy from England, and this is the use I have made of it: Mr. Gellert, the only man, perhaps, in Germany equal to the task, has undertaken to translate it; and, I flatter myself, the original will lose none of its beauties under his hands'.[343] Moreover, Reich reported Gellert's sentiments toward Richardson: "Nothing but a Mr. Richardson, and the friendship I have for you, could prevail with me to undertake this affair', he said to me. For this worthy man is closely engaged in business, and has long been afflicted with an ill state of health'.[344]

Gellert was a moral and religious man. He believed taste and morals could improve society and believed that any civilised society must be made up of particularly virtuous individuals, which were formed through 'the development of an aesthetic and moral taste' informed predominantly by readings of Shaftesbury.[345] More importantly, Gellert believed that through his works, he might influence men, and the military, to be more disposed to peace. Bernd Witte's recent work on Gellert has shown him to be conscientious in his open objections to the effects of war on the people and places of Germany, as well as forthright in his belief that religion was a key to morality, which had been lost during the Seven Years' War.[346] As Witte notes, the cantonment of troops in Leipzig had brought the war to Gellert's doorstep.[347] After Mitchell had informed him that he had arranged for Gellert to meet Frederick, Gellert confided to a friend that he would confront Frederick on the questions of morality and religion. Gellert said he would 'defend the honour of the Christian religion against all kings', and that Frederick 'may already know that I have composed spiritual songs; and that is very dear to me. If he [Frederick] scoffs at me, I will say to him: 'Sire, these songs are being sung and prayed by your armies, and the Christian poems make good citizens and faithful soldiers".[348]

---

[341] Wraxall, *Historical memoirs*, p. 33. On this page Wraxall claims that *Amelia* is to Fielding, what *Pamela* was to Richardson – meaning, he deems them inferior to *Tom Jones* and *Clarissa* respectively.
[342] Mary Helen McMurran, 'Contemporary transnational reception', in Sabor and Schellenberg, eds, *Samuel Richardson in context*.
[343] *Ibid.*, p. 94.
[344] Philipp Reich to Samuel Richardson, 10 May 1754, in Anna Laetitia Barbauld, ed, *The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, 6 vols., Vol. 5 (London, 1805), pp. 297-298.
[345] Engbers, *Der "Moral-Sense"*, p. 59.
[346] This paragraph draws upon Witte's chapter. See Witte, 'Der Dichter', particularly pp. 77-81.
[347] *Ibid.*, p. 80.
[348] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

b. Gellert's meeting with Frederick

Reports suggest that Gellert was summoned to meet Frederick on 18 December 1760. An English report of the meeting dating the summons to 18 October 1760 is wrong due to a timeline error.[349] During their interview, which appears to have around or between 12 and 18 December 1760, Frederick immediately gave Mitchell's recommendation of Gellert as the reason for their meeting.[350] The interview, as it is retold, gave Gellert a chance to speak earnestly to Frederick about the talents of native German writers. Gellert attributed the lack of a 'golden age' of German writers to the reality that they we living in an age of war, much as the Romans had suffered. Gellert asked Frederick for peace, which might enable German literati to flourish, and that calmness and generosity on the part of patrons was necessary to achieve this.[351] Frederick noted 'aye, there it is that the shoe generally pinches the German literati'.[352]

Frederick resisted Gellert's arguments that kind and peaceful rule was conducive to a more vibrant creativity in the arts and sciences. When Gellert argued that 'perhaps we still miss August [Augustus, the Roman Emperor] and Louis XIV', Frederick quipped that 'Saxony already had two Augusts', referring to the chaotic rule of Augustus II and III, Kings of Poland and Electors of Saxony. Witte has argued that this gave Gellert 'the opportunity to defend the honour of German literature': 'We have already made a very good start in the belles lettres [schönen Wissenschaften] in Saxony. I'm not talking about Saxony alone; I'm talking of all Germany'.[353] According to Witte, this was not only unnervingly self-confident, but also gave a more accurate assessment of the state of belles lettres in northern Germany than that which has been historically presumed, particularly by near-contemporaries such as Goethe.[354] Gellert sealed this self-confidence when, in response to Frederick's question of whether, as a writer of fables, he was imitating the Frenchman Jean de la Fontaine, Gellert replied 'No, sire, I am an original'.[355] As Witte has argued, Gellert saw his originality in the simplicity of his moral fables, one of which he recited to Frederick. The fable, called *The Painter of Athens*, told the story of an artist who painted a god of war, only for the critic to detest it and the layman to adore it. The moral was that 'when the critic does not like thy bit of writing, it is a bad sign for thee; when the Fool admires, it is time thou at once strike it out'.[356] He urged Frederick to take the lead on literature, arguing, 'I can only recommend, where you command'.[357] As Witte has noted, 'it can be

---

[349] 'Authentick conversation between the king of Prussia and the ingenious Mr. Gellert, professor of Belles Lettres at Leipsick; extracted from a letter dated, Leipsick, January 27, 1761, in *Annual Register, or a view of the history, politicks, and literature, of the year 1762* (London, 1763), p. 35.
[350] *Ibid.* An account of the interview in German is given in *Briefe von Rabener und Gellert, wie auch des letzten Unterredung mit dem König von Preussen* (Köln, 1761). It is also found in John F. Reynolds, ed, *C. F. Gellerts Briefwechsel*, Vol. 3 (Berlin and New York, 1991), pp. 78-81.
[351] Witte, 'Der Dichter', p. 80.
[352] 'Authentick conversation', p. 36.
[353] Witte, 'Der Dichter', p. 81.
[354] *Ibid.*
[355] *Ibid.*
[356] Thomas Carlyle, *History of Friedrich II. of Prussia, Called the Great*, Vol. 12 (Leipzig, 1865), p. 159.
[357] *Ibid.*, p. 158.

presumed that the King of Prussia, whom Gleim, Ramler and Kleist venerated as the 'god of war', understood the devastating judgement hidden in Gellert's allusion'.[358]

Gellert immediately spread the word that Mitchell was the sole reason for his rapidly rising standing with Frederick. He was anxious to continue to grow the relationship with Mitchell, and lamented to a friend that he waited for Mitchell to summon him.[359] Gellert dined with Mitchell on 5 January 1761, which he recorded in his diary. Although feeling unwell, Gellert noted that they dined for two hours, an invitation he had gladly taken up. 'He appeared to be a brave man', Gellert wrote of Mitchell, 'and his secretary Burnet a very dear man'. The same day some councilmen and merchants of Leipzig were locked up, and Gellert seems to lament his difficult situation and the relative lack of progress in himself.[360] Two days later, Gellert wrote to his sister that Mitchell, 'a brave man, is my great patron and friend, and is the real reason that the King is desirous of speaking with me'.[361] Gellert explained that Frederick gave him an open invitation to dine with him, and that Mitchell might read a word or two from Frederick as it relates to Gellert himself.[362] His most heartfelt praise of Mitchell was recorded at this time. He wrote to Johann Erdmuth von Schönfeld, his long-time correspondent:

> In addition I have been these last few days some hours with the English envoy; and this man is my great supporter, I must say. He intends, that I should dine with him as often as I would like; and I privately supposed that it might not happen too often. When I thanked him, that as an Englishman he had made me known first of all to a German King; he reassured me, he would be richly rewarded, because on the day after my meeting with the King, the King has sung my praises to him. Really I would like to be so often with this man, if I should not eat with him. He loves the Saxons, as it appears, and likes to indulge himself in learned conversation, without willing it.[363]

Gellert recorded in his diary visiting Mitchell again on 9 January, where he found Mitchell with 'Geheimdenrath Fritsch von Dresden', Thomas Freiherr von Fritsch.[364] Von Fritsch was a Saxon statesman who oversaw a large part of the rebuilding of Saxony and Dresden during and after the Seven Years War, and who also held a long-standing interest in the French and Scottish Enlightenments.[365] Gellert stayed for

---

[358] Witte, 'Der Dichter', p. 81.
[359] Gellert to Johanna Erdmuth von Schönfeld, 15 December 1760, in Reynolds, ed, *Briefwechsel*, p. 83.
[360] *Chr. F. Gellert's Tagebuch aus dem Jahre 1761* (Leipzig, 1862), pp. 4-5.
[361] Gellert to his sister, 7 January 1761, in *C. F. Gellert's Sämmtliche Schriften*, Vol. 9 (Berlin and Leipzig, 1867), p. 211.
[362] *Ibid.*
[363] Gellert to Johanna Erdmuth von Schönfeld, 8 January 1761, in Reynolds, ed, *Briefwechsel*, pp. 91-92.
[364] *Chr. F. Gellert's Tagebuch*, 9 January 1761, p. 6.
[365] Robert Beachy, 'The alchemy of credit: Saxony's *Rétablissement* after 1763', in Ute Planert and James Retallack, eds, *Decades of reconstruction: Postwar societies, state-building, and international relations from the Seven Years' War to the Cold War* (Cambridge, 2017), p. 144.

a few hours before moving on. It wasn't until nearly three weeks later that Gellert wrote to Rabener informing him of the substance of his interview with Frederick. In this letter he reaffirmed to Rabener that he had dined with Frederick, Mitchell, d'Argens, Catt, Marwitz, and others, where Frederick again sung his praises. Gellert writes:

> The English envoy [Mitchell], who is an admirable man, is very truthfully the real reason, why I saw the King; the envoy has shared large parts of my fables with Strauben in Breslau, and is very much partial to them.[366]

Gellert's friends were also abuzz with Mitchell's efforts. Gleim wrote to Ramler that 'one of my greatest pleasures in Leipzig was the acquaintance with the English envoy Mitchell…'. He went on:

> … this excellent man, who our great Frederick had so readily loved as I, who with his King and people assuredly does all for us that he can do, who is known to be a statesman and honest man, who holds the renowned Bolingbroke to be a poor mind and criticises him, because he was a statesman and wrote mostly on religion; who again excuses Pope from the charge that his moral character has not been fully perfected, and when he heard of the blow from La Mettrie, that he had fooled our Haller,[367] said: Je respecte ce cuisinier qui l'a tué;[368] in short a man, whose whole intellect and heart, truly embodied his people; he wants, after he has read Haller in French translation, to learn German with all his might, I should suggest to him some books; I said, I would like to remember this, and in those days I brought to him a half dozen of our best...[369]

Though Gellert would have the final say on Mitchell's contribution to German literature in July 1761, both Sulzer and Gottsched were full of praise for Mitchell in the interim. Sulzer was given the opportunity to meet Frederick in Leipzig, and had a series of meetings with the monarch, facilitated by Mitchell. Sulzer was raising a subscription for a medallion commemorating the brave deeds of Colonel von der Heyde in

---

366 Gellert to Rabener, 29 January 1761, in *Briefwechsel Christian Fürchtegott Gellert's mit Demoiselle Lucius* (Leipzig, 1823), p. 630.
367 La Mettrie had been an extremely strong critic of Haller and had written scathingly about him. See Raymond de Saussure, 'Haller and La Mettrie', *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*, 4 (1949), pp. 431-449.
368 'I respect the cook who killed him', a reference to La Mettrie's death from food poisoning, which was the result of overeating pâte aux truffes (truffle paste).
369 Gleim to Ramler, 8 January 1761, in Heinrich Pröhle, *Friedrich der Große und die deutsche Literatur* (Berlin, 1872), p. 224.

his defence of Colberg, something Frederick was supporting in correspondence with Sulzer and d'Argens. Sulzer told his friend Bodmer that d'Argens and Mitchell 'praise the Germans to the King more than they [the Germans] could through their own works'.[370] Gottsched, after his own meetings with Frederick, looked back on his acquaintance with Mitchell fondly: he thought Mitchell 'scholarly, distinguished and honourable'.[371] If, as Bernhard Fabian has argued, Germans and German literary figures were looking for a deeper experience of English culture to augment the 'isolated fragments' they had been exposed to, then the words of Gellert, Sulzer and Gleim quoted here show that Mitchell could form a valuable fount of knowledge on English literature, philosophy and culture.[372]

In the above noted letter of Sulzer to Bodmer, Sulzer notes the shyness of Gellert which would inhibit his growth were it not for Mitchell, which was also a factor outlined in Stormont's letters to Mitchell on the subject of Gellert's future.[373] Gellert was too meek, according to Sulzer, to go again to meet Frederick.[374] Mitchell thus took it upon himself to secure for Gellert a pension and ongoing support from the Prussian crown for Gellert's professorship in Leipzig. Mitchell informed Gellert in March 1761 that he had written to Stormont, unbidden and without Gellert's knowledge, asking Stormont to seek a favourable position for Gellert in Saxony.[375] Gellert, reluctant to impose or to seek further advancement, wrote to Brühl, who had been tasked with helping to secure Gellert a position, and pleaded both ignorance and reluctance. He blamed the whole sorry affair of his (unwanted) advancement on Mitchell. 'About my future, which, unknowingly for me, the English envoy Mitchell valued, I am heartily shocked', adding later that:

> I know it, dear Count, I assure you, that I bid the envoy to give me no such value, and to not have given it a thought. It has never been in my heart. I seek no office, I wish for no pension, I am sick, and can no longer hope for tenure, I suffer no defects, and God gives me more than many others, how could I desire more? I have told all this to the envoy when I received his letter, but to no avail.[376]

---

[370] Sulzer to Bodmer, 10 February 1761, in Gustav Berthold Volz, ed, *Friedrich der Grosse im Spiegel seiner Zeit*, Vol. 3 (Berlin, 1901), p. 41
[371] Doran, *Andrew Mitchell*, p. 286.
[372] Fabian, 'Translators and intermediaries', in Fabian, *The English book*, p. 104.
[373] Sulzer to Bodmer, 10 February 1761, in Volz, ed, *Friedrich der Grosse*, Vol. 3, p. 41.
[374] Gellert's meekness, or inhibitions, could be partially explained by the unfortunate theft, and publication, of letters from him to Rabener of a sensitive political nature in early 1761. See Johannes Birgfeld, 'Unfreiwillige Politisierung der Literatur *oder* Rechtverstoß als Erfolgsstrategie. Rabener und Gellert als Opfer eines sächsisch-patriotischen Verlegers', in Claude D. Conter, ed, *Justitiabilität und Rechtmäßigkeit. Verrechtlichungsprozesse von Literatur und Film in der Moderne* (Amsterdam and New York, 2010), pp. 149-168; Sibylle Schönborn, *Das Buch der Seele. Tagebuchliteratur zwischen Aufklärung und Kunstperiode* (Tübingen, 1999), pp. 64-85.
[375] Gellert to Johanna Erdmuth von Schönfeld, 13 March 1761, in Reynolds, *Briefwechsel*, p. 112.
[376] Gellert to Brühl, 16 May 1761, in Reynolds, ed, *Briefwechsel*, p. 139.

Gellert was emotionally disturbed by the Seven Years' War, and as a devoted Saxon, might have felt disinclined to meet Frederick.[377] However, he showed no sign of disinclination in his letters to Mitchell. Despite this, he does exhibit the 'hypochondria' that was associated with him later in his life, and which left him at times fearful of his health and his life.[378] He also lamented the effect of the war on Saxony, but his sister informed him that, due to his reputation, the Prussians had not burdened their hometown with many billeted troops. The biography of Gellert supplied after his death by Johann Andreas Cramer notes that 'foreigners of the greatest distinction tried to encrease his emoluments'. It goes on: 'Mr Mitchel, the English envoy, employed himself to this purpose, with zeal, unknown to Gellert, who was very grateful for his exertions, though he himself opposed the success of the solicitation'.[379] As noted above, Gellert, in letters to Count Brühl of Saxony, argued that his powers were on the wane; that it was not modesty that prevented his accepting offers to go as Professor to Dresden, but rather poor health; and that he had everything he needed where he was currently situated.[380]

Gellert's pleading, excuses, and general lack of will to make a position for himself, or advance his future, had left Mitchell with all the impetus to do so on his behalf. However, this did not stop Gellert writing to another envoy, Johann Wenzel von Widmann, that Mitchell alone was genuinely supportive of both Gellert himself, and Prince Ferdinand. For Gellert, Mitchell was 'a man of an admirable character, and the only one who has had mercy for me'.[381] In June 1761 Mitchell had written to Stormont, his counterpart in Saxony, to facilitate further support for Gellert there, as financial insecurity was still a concern for Gellert. Mitchell obliged Stormont, based at the Polish court, to work with Count Brühl (now the favourite there) to convince Gellert to accept the pension. Brühl informed Stormont that he feared Gellert would turn down the offer, and expressed his anger at Gellert's 'ill timed modesty'. Stormont added that, Brühl 'assured me, & in that he cannot be mistaken as he himself studied at Leipzig, that the whole business of such a professor, is to read twice a week … features upon Aristotle's Logick Metaphysicks'. He concluded by reassuring Mitchell that Lady Stormont would press the issue with Gellert, and he urged Mitchell 'don't let yr friend marr his own fortune by this false delicacy'.[382] Mitchell's urging won out, as did that of Brühl, and Gellert accepted the 300 crowns per year, though he did 'not know what to do with such a prodigious income'.[383] Gellert then wrote Mitchell, saying that Mitchell's 'illustrious name' would 'always be sacred to all Saxony'.[384] Later, in a final praise of Mitchell, Widmann himself wrote to Gellert that his brother, the metallurgist C. E. Gellert, could not write Mitchell's praises enough. The praise was also aimed at Mitchell's ability to make connections, and to perhaps leverage these for the gain of himself and others, like C. F.

[377] Witte, 'Der Dichter', where Gellert's thoughts on peace are a general theme of pages 77-81.
[378] Kerstin E. Reimann, "Es ist ein köstlich Ding geduldig sein.' Die Edition der nachgelassenen Schriften Christian Fürchtegott Gellerts', in Schönborn and Viehöver, eds, *Gellert*, p. 291.
[379] Johann Andreas Cramer, *The life of Professor Gellert; with a course of moral lessons, delivered by him in the University of Leipsick*, trans. Mrs Douglas, 3 vols, Vol. 1 (London and Edinburgh, 1805), p. 102.
[380] *Ibid.*, pp. 102-105.
[381] Gellert to Widmann, 17 May 1761, in *Ibid.*, p. 141.
[382] Stormont to Mitchell, 27 June 1761, BL Add MS 6827, f. 176.
[383] Stormont to Mitchell, 30 September 1761, BL Add MS 6827, ff. 178-179.
[384] Gellert to Mitchell, 30 July 1761, BL Add MS 6858, ff. 103-104.

Gellert. 'The general fame that this Minister has acquired for himself, increases so greatly that he understands how to appreciate and profit from the service of high- and well-born people'.[385]

Thus, despite Gellert's reluctance, Mitchell had gone on doing in Leipzig in the winter of 1760-1761, what he had done most of his adult life: support intellectuals to realise both their full potential, and the credit and renown he thought they were owed, or had earned. Gellert's timidity in pushing for a tenured position at Leipzig University, and his fear of offending his social superiors, presented, to him, an insurmountable obstacle. But when Mitchell was able to get involved on his behalf, to act as his supporter and patron – and take a genuine interest in his work – bridges were built for Gellert that he otherwise may have never been able to cross. What is also clear from the above analysis is that Mitchell saw some benefit for himself in the promotion of German authors. His comment to Gellert that Frederick's praise was enough reward for him, certainly shows that Mitchell derived a satisfaction from conversing with, and patronising authors and intellectuals. Yet in addition, he realised that Frederick's esteem for him would be of great use in his diplomatic endeavours. Having Frederick's favour certainly acted as an extra bonding agent between Mitchell and the King. It strengthened British and German ties through literature and culture, and weakened Frederick's cultural links to France. Thus as this section has aimed to show, while Gellert became a friend of Mitchell, and Mitchell had a genuine interest in his work, the promotion of Gellert was one more demonstration of his ability to combine intellectual life with diplomacy and politics.

The aftermath of the meetings produced no ground-breaking shifts in German literature. As noted above, Frederick's ideas remained unmoved despite being impressed with some of the ideas of the men he met. As Grundolf noted above, Frederick was out of touch with changes in literary trends. Gellert did not travel to Leipzig and did not take up the post Mitchell had wanted him to take. However, German literature itself continued to grow and, according to Nicholas Boyle, the end of the Seven Years War propelled Germany into more turbulent cultural change. 'The greatly heightened prestige of English culture after the war meant easier access to a free-thinking and individualist Enlightenment', Boyle argues, 'which increased the friction between intellectuals and the social and political structure of absolutist Germany'.[386] The mixed success of Mitchell's efforts paralleled the vulnerable position of German literature in general, which, as Lessing saw it, was struggling to define itself among other courtly pursuits, and against cultural and economic authorities.[387]

vii. Conclusion

[385] Widmann to Gellert, 27 February 1762, in Reynolds, *Briefwechsel*, p. 203.
[386] Nicholas Boyle, *German literature: A very short introduction* (Oxford, 2008), p. 60.
[387] *Ibid.*, p. 61.

Mitchell proved to be a good friend to the German writers and intellectuals he met. Moreover, he took opportunities to promote their interests and, as an intentional or unintentional follow on, was brought closer to Frederick and his inner circle, including d'Argens, Catt, and Quintus Icilius, because of it. He utilised the networks he made in his diplomatic life in Berlin to great effect in placing native German culture on a higher stage. The importance Mitchell placed on Frederick not only meeting, but also endorsing and following up on his meetings with German authors reinforced Frederick's fond view of Mitchell. This was crucial in maintaining Mitchell's strong position at court and his bond with Frederick, which would climax the following year before suffering a major blow with the loss of the British subsidy to Prussia (Chapter 7).

This chapter has also explored Mitchell's relationship with David Hume. It has cast both in a new light, and demonstrated a fond familiarity that existed over time. It has also demonstrated the faith that Hume and Millar, to name a couple, had in Mitchell's ability to keep secrets and to keep important material secure. Though his reputation as a great friend of Montesquieu might have preceded him to Berlin (as Thiébault noted), Mitchell's actions in Prussia and elsewhere in Germany show a man comfortable in both a diplomatic and literary costume. For Mitchell, they blended seamlessly and with little notice of any real difference in the way the conduct of relationships might change or shift between the two. It seems to have been this method of conducting his career – using his position to promote literature, and vice versa – that was one of the key reasons why he was so praised by so many Germans, but which also kept him in the close confidence of Frederick.

Chapter 7

The limits of diplomacy: An analysis of diplomatic changes between Britain and Prussia during the second half of Mitchell's posting, 1762-1771

i. Introduction

By 1762, with the war in Europe largely drawing to a halt, the hardest tasks of Mitchell's Berlin tenure seemed complete. He had attended Frederick on the battlefield, and in the various locations around Prussia and Silesia which that monarch had ventured to in defence of his kingdom. Mitchell had endured bouts of ill health, fatigue, and general pessimism about the state of the war effort and his own nation's many prevarications and missteps. The hardest part for Mitchell, however, was that obtaining peace would come at the cost of some of the most important personal relationships he had built up in the preceding six years. An additionally important factor in the reading of the diplomatic situation over 1761-1762 is that Mitchell did not see Frederick in person for about one year, between May 1761 and May 1762. Therefore, his personal brand of diplomacy was not ineffectual, but rather, non-existent. Britain's relationship to Frederick and Prussia was thus critically undermined when decisions were being made in Britain about the future of the Prussian subsidy and the dramatic change in Russian leadership. Though the strong edifice of Mitchell's relationship to Frederick was forged in war, it was beginning to crumble in the light of Britain's, and Frederick's, ultimate aims for peace in post-war Britain and Prussia. While this seems to have been exacerbated by the conduct of the British ministry in the early days of 1762, there is no doubt that Frederick now seemed to take his opportunity to realign himself with Russia, which he had come to regard as representing the greatest threat to the security of his kingdom in the future.[1] As noted here, Mitchell was not present at that time, and could only come to Frederick's side in 1762 to make protests on behalf of Bute, and the British ministry's actions.

There are several questions that arise from the observation that Frederick sought to move quickly to secure Russia's friendship. Firstly, was it true that Frederick aimed at a Russian alliance, or did he take the opportunity arising from the fortuitous worship of him by Peter III? To answer that, the second question must be, did Britain have any chance of salvaging a Prussian alliance, and indeed, did it wish to do so? Thirdly, what role did Mitchell play in the events of the first half of 1762, which effectively realigned

[1] H. M. Scott, '1763-1786: The second reign of Frederick the Great?' in Dwyer, *The rise of Prussia,* pp. 190-191; Ritter, *Frederick the Great*, pp. 186-187.

the balance of European diplomacy once more? In answering these questions, this chapter aims to look in more detail at the relationship between Mitchell and Frederick. It has generally been the view of historians that Mitchell was a victim of circumstance, who lost the friendship of Frederick purely by the machinations of Britain's ministry toward Prussia. Thus, Mitchell was an innocent victim of international diplomacy and politics. This chapter seeks to interrogate this viewpoint. One of the focus points will be the circumstances surrounding the 'Galitzin letter' of 1762, which triggered a major diplomatic incident and accelerated Prussia's separation from Britain. It seems Mitchell was largely in the dark about this diplomatic incident, but a reading of the available materials suggests that Frederick might have felt Mitchell to be complicit in what he saw as a gross deception on the part of Britain towards Prussia.

In any case, it seems clear that Mitchell's view of Frederick had shifted from a worshipful one, to one more pessimistic about Frederick's rule and the way in which he aimed to reconstruct his kingdom in the wake of the destruction of the war. These two periods – the worshipful, political partnership and the other of a distanced observer, align quite neatly with Mitchell's two periods in Prussia. He was officially recalled to London in 1764, and returned to Berlin in 1766 to face a much-changed political landscape. Thereafter, Mitchell's criticism is not limited to perceived missteps in the running of Prussia; indeed, his criticism after 1762, and even more so after his return from Britain in 1766, was more personal, stained perhaps by his diplomatic isolation but also by his reading of Frederick's character. It is worthwhile in this chapter to chart the change in Mitchell's perception of Frederick, as it has an impact on Prussian-British diplomacy, and also, a negative effect on the kind of cultural diplomacy Mitchell had sought to practice in the preceding years. Each part of this chapter aims to add context to the next. The aim is to highlight those turning points which need clarification or further explanation as to their significance and contingency. The chapter firstly addresses British foreign policy in the early 1760s. It then explores Britain's diplomatic relationship and breakdown with Prussia in more detail, in order to add context for the investigation of Mitchell and Frederick's relationship from 1762 to 1771. Thereafter, it explores Mitchell's criticisms of Frederick's rebuilding of Prussia, and the end of his life in Berlin in the context of a realistic appraisal of the arguments made throughout the chapter.

ii. British foreign policy in the early 1760s: an overview

Britain's complex domestic and foreign political positions in the early 1760s were, and are, a source of debate. Various divides put focuses on sea power or land power, military or financial intervention, and the balance of trade and power. According to Brendan Simms, one issue that was not up for debate was the understanding that Britain was inevitably and actively responsible for maintaining the balance of power in

Europe.[2] However, when George III came to the throne in 1760, Britain's will to intervene in European affairs was diminished, and replaced by a strategy that took a larger view of their colonial and maritime empire, moving away from the firm attachment to Hanover that had previously existed.[3] The proponents of a maritime strategy argued for 'exclusive concentration on colonial maritime power', drawing on an argument that harked back to the reign of Elizabeth I. Those who argued for a continental strategy, as had been pursued more contemporaneously, thought that involvement in Europe preceded any maritime priorities.[4] More broadly, George III's aim to rule without party, according to Jeremy Black, revived 'the theme of the king as a dangerous political force', and added further complexity to British politics and its aims by his inability to 'forge acceptable relationships with senior politicians on his accession, which contributed greatly to the ministerial and political instability of the 1760s'.[5] The problem of the King's overreliance on Bute, and the King's dislike of Pitt's desire to control ministerial appointments, made effective government increasingly difficult at a time when Britain was facing post-war settlements and negotiations.[6] This fits firmly within the context of debates between Newcastle, Pitt, and Bute in this chapter.

Previously a critic of British protection of Hanover, Pitt eventually became one of the strongest proponents for protection of Hanover. But as scholars have noted, the change of monarch in 1760 and its subsequent change in focus for Hanover, left Pitt in the position of supporting an isolated political stance.[7] According to Simms, Pitt then spun Britain's commitment to Hanover and the 'German war' as one he had inherited, and one which ought to take a back seat to British 'marine and colonies'.[8] When it came to Prussia, George III was not enamoured of Frederick, and in his first speech to the Privy Council, only unwillingly acceded to Pitt's insertions about concerting with their allies, namely, Prussia.[9]

The link between Britain and Prussia had never been a formal alliance, but rather a subsidy convention. It signified, according to Derek McKay and Hamish Scott, that while 'mutual dependence and the magic name of Pitt were strong enough to hide the divergent interests of the two states', what it actually demonstrated was that 'Britain's support for Prussia was essentially opportunistic, a way of protecting Hanover and of tying down French resources on the Continent'.[10] Pitt noted as much in a speech of

---

[2] Brendan Simms, 'British strategic culture, 1714-1760', in Hamish Scott and Brendan Simms, eds, *Cultures of power in Europe during the long eighteenth century* (Cambridge, 2009), p. 119.
[3] Jeremy Black, *America or Europe?: British foreign policy, 1739-63* (London, 1998), p. 102. George III retained an interest in Hanover, but this consisted of managing it through the prism of the Holy Roman Empire rather than through Britain. See Torsten Riotte, 'George III and Hanover', in Brendan Simms and Torsten Riotte, eds, *The Hanoverian dimension in British history, 1714-1837* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 58-85.
[4] Karl W. Schweizer, 'An unpublished parliamentary speech by the elder Pitt, 9 December 1761', *Historical Research*, 64 (1991), p. 94.
[5] Jeremy Black, *George III: America's last king* (New Haven and London, 2006), pp. 49, 54.
[6] Jeremy Black, *The Hanoverians: The history of a dynasty* (London and New York, 2004), pp. 119-123.
[7] Scott, *British foreign policy*, p. 33; Brendan Simms, 'Pitt and Hanover', in Simms and Riotte, eds, *The Hanoverian dimension,* pp. 54-55.
[8] Simms, 'Pitt and Hanover'*,* pp. 54-55.
[9] Black, *George III*, pp. 58, 61.
[10] Derek McKay and H. M. Scott, *The rise of the great powers 1648-1815* (London and New York, 1983), pp. 196-197.

December 1761, when he argued in parliament that 'however inconvenient and expensive the German war is for England, it is more inconvenient and more expensive for France than it is for England; then the inference is that upon the whole, it is beneficial for England'.[11] As Black notes, uncertainty was the watchword in the early 1760s and this did not make for a solid, reliable, and predictable set of actions from within the British ministry. To confirm this, and to set the uncertainty of the successive ministries and monarchical agendas into context, Black notes that, despite being four years into the Seven Years' War, the marginalia to a draft of the King's Speech in 1761 still questioned 'Whether to say anything, and what, of the King of Prussia'.[12] The ministry was also not as informed as it might have been due to Mitchell's absence from Frederick's side.

In a broader sense, Hamish Scott has noted the transitions in British diplomacy after the Seven Years' War. He has noted the complexity of Britain's positions between America, Europe, and the maritime colonies, and noted the competing interests of Prussia, Spain, Portugal, and France in British diplomatic decisions. These must be taken into account when considering the confusion and lack of clarity surrounding the changing British diplomatic situations at the close of the Seven Years' War. Britain was trying to achieve a number of objectives while facing new problems. She was seeking a peace with France that would bring the war to a close; facing a union of France and Spain – a 'Bourbon Family Compact' – from 1761, which became war with Spain in 1762-1763; and was ending her support for Prussia which had seen them both through the war, which fed into a larger change around focusing on internal politics and its maritime and colonial operations.[13]

iii. 1762 Part I: Turning points in Prussian-British diplomatic relations

At the close of 1761 it seemed that Prussia, and by extension Mitchell, were due for yet another torrid year of war. Despite reports of the Russian Empress Elizabeth's ill health, she survived the year. It was during 1761 that Britain underwent transformations which were to precipitate what has been seen as a fundamental mismanagement of their foreign affairs in relation to Prussia. It also coincided largely with Mitchell's absence and the resulting lack of personal diplomacy which had carried the relationship between Britain and Prussia that far. The interests of the key British players in this chapter – the Duke of Newcastle, Lord Bute, and William Pitt – should be outlined. British foreign policy was under the control of the Duke of Newcastle until May 1762, and as he was the architect and key proponent of the 'Old System' of alliances (which had broken down spectacularly in 1756), he was a keen advocate for its restoration. Pitt was Secretary of State for the Southern Department, and Bute was Secretary of State for the Northern

[11] Schweizer, 'An unpublished parliamentary speech', p. 102.
[12] Jeremy Black, *Parliament and foreign policy in the eighteenth century* (Cambridge, 2004), p. 100.
[13] Scott, *British foreign policy*, outlined in Chapter 3.

Department. Newcastle saw it as vital that the restoration of British links to Austria could be used to offset other shifts in allegiance in Europe. In sum, his main aim was peace, and he had a good support base to advocate for this.[14] The stances of Pitt and Bute were rather different. Pitt argued for a continuation of the war until peace terms satisfactory to Britain could be obtained. As Jeremy Black explains, in the summer of 1761 Pitt's 'tendency to believe that he alone could be relied on to defend national interests had been accentuated, as had his distrust of the Bourbons'.[15] Bute's position was, as Schweizer argues, somewhere between Newcastle and Pitt. For Schweizer, Bute took a similar, but softer, view to Pitt: he 'sought an honourable, enduring peace which would satisfy national ambition yet also be acceptable to France'.[16]

Newcastle was concerned, as Schweizer has argued, that Britain have some mooring on the continent, to offset the permanent vigilance which she must maintain against the pretensions of France. At first, it seemed that the Prussian alliance would work for a time; however, the deteriorating Prussian situation was the addition to the sum that Newcastle was making to return Britain to its Austrian connection.[17] According to Horace Walpole, in early 1761 there certainly seems to have been a turning of public opinion against the arduous commitment Britain had made to Prussia, both in cabinet and in the nation more broadly.[18] In this context, it was Newcastle who in 1761 had secretly suggested that Silesia, divided by Prussia and Austria in the First and Second Silesian Wars, might revert to Austria in a possible revival of the 'Old System'.[19] It was to be one of Britain's major flaws, as Frederick saw it, that the internal debate over British foreign policy was permanently hindering that nation's ability to make decisive alliances.[20]

Abortive peace negotiations with France in 1761 may not have been to the taste of all in the British ministry. Newcastle, in what became part of his 'psychological profile' according to Karl Schweizer, was bent on retaining a core of European alliances for Britain that would offset any block that might emerge alongside France against British interests.[21] If France were to ally with Spain and form a dreaded 'Bourbon family compact' – which they did in August 1761[22] – then Newcastle believed that an alliance with Prussia alone would leave Britain in a precarious position, though he was somewhat undecided about Pitt's argument that Britain may need to widen the war effort to take on Spain.[23] From the beginning it was clear that Prussia would be a major complication in Anglo-French negotiations.[24] George III was very supportive

[14] Karl W. Schweizer, *Frederick the Great, William Pitt, and Lord Bute: The Anglo-Prussian Alliance, 1756-1763* (New York and London, 1991), p. 121.
[15] Black, *Pitt the Elder*, p. 220.
[16] Schweizer, *Frederick the Great*, p. 121.
[17] Schweizer, 'Lord Bute', pp. 79-80.
[18] Horace Walpole to Horace Mann, 2 January 1761, in *Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence*, Vol. 21, p. 466.
[19] Schweizer, 'Lord Bute', p. 85.
[20] Jeremy Black, 'Britain's foreign alliances in the eighteenth century', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 20 (1988), p. 573.
[21] Schweizer, 'Lord Bute', p. 78.
[22] Scott, *British foreign policy*, p. 30.
[23] Black, *Pitt the Elder*, pp. 217, 220; Jeremy Black, 'Pitt the Elder and the foundation of an imperial foreign policy', in T. G. Otte, ed, *The makers of British foreign policy: From Pitt to Thatcher* (Houndmills and New York, 2002), p. 43.
[24] Szabo, *The Seven Years War in Europe*, p. 350.

of breaking with Frederick, with whom he had never had a true affinity. Jeremy Black has suggested that George III was pushing a breach with Prussia in order to mitigate Austro-Prussian dominance within the Holy Roman Empire, where George was still Elector of Hanover.[25] Others have suggested that Newcastle acted against Spain in order to separate Austria and France, bringing Austria back to a British alliance.[26] As Hamish Scott has summarised, the Old System was, first and foremost, 'a means of fighting and defeating France and, where this became necessary, her Bourbon ally, Spain'. Scott is also careful to add that Newcastle's overriding interest was a link to *Germany* – this could be Prussia, or Austria.[27]

We do not know precisely the Duke of Newcastle's role in attempting to revive the Old System. The lack of common agenda between him and the Secretary of State for the Northern Department, the Earl of Bute, had strained the ministry. Newcastle had put on record his willingness to deal fairly with Frederick in the context of Britain's interests and those that might suit them both. Newcastle was consistently of the opinion that Prussia would have to make some territorial concessions in order to secure peace – parts of Frederick's eastern lands were occupied by Russia, and Frederick himself had occupied Silesia which Austria wanted back. Ultimately, according to Schweizer, Newcastle (wrongly as it transpired) thought Frederick would accept a partition of Silesia, enabling Newcastle to use this offer to bring Austria back to alliance with Britain.[28] Bute, however, was more in tune with George III's wishes – in squashing the Bourbon Family Compact, Pitt had seen alliance with Prussia as one of the key ways to prevent France's ability to fight the war, whereas Bute sought to nullify France by obtaining peace with them.[29] When it came to Newcastle, Bute worked in cooperation with him, and wrote passionately in his defence in October 1761.[30] It later appears, however, the Bute was playing a diplomatic game that did not accord with Newcastle's overarching aims and which, it seemed, he was destined to lose in light of Newcastle's pretensions to control foreign policy and revive union with Austria.[31]

The lack of cooperation from the powers with which Bute sought to negotiate – Austria, the Dutch Republic, and Prussia – began to become a source of confusion due to conflicting agendas. This is where it is important to ascertain whether Frederick had determined to break with Britain regardless of the renewal of a subsidy, or whether he only made this choice when it became clear (at least in Frederick's understanding) that Bute was steering Britain away from Prussia. With the acceleration of Newcastle's interventions in policy, Bute seems to have been attempting to catch up while being unable to dictate the policy direction. While Schweizer's research makes clear that Bute and Newcastle were to some degree victims of the personal diplomacy of others (namely Prince Louis of Brunswick in his meeting with Austria's

[25] Jeremy Black, *George III: America's Last King*, paperback edn (New Haven and London, 2008), p. 316.
[26] Szabo, *The Seven Years War in Europe*, p. 376.
[27] Scott, "The true principles of the revolution', pp. 57, 77.
[28] Schweizer, 'Lord Bute', pp. 80-81.
[29] Scott, "True principles", pp. 44-45.
[30] Karl W. Schweizer, 'A lost letter of John Stuart, 3rd earl of Bute, to George Grenville, 13 October 1761', *The Historical Journal*, 17 (1974), pp. 435-442.
[31] Schweizer, 'Lord Bute', pp. 84-86.

Baron Reischach), it was precisely the mismanagement of the direction of foreign policy that put them in that position.[32] It might also be added that, particularly during 1762, Bute was receiving letters from George III blaming Frederick for unnecessary and unfounded accusations against Britain, and accusing Frederick of personally insulting him. George III argued that 'my character of King makes it necessary to not suffer this ill usage, my country is attack'd through me, for as our interest is inseparable, when my veracity is doubted that is not only giving me affront but tis affronting Britain'.[33]

Newcastle has been shown by Schweizer (above) and by D. B. Horn, to have been at times the architect of his own problems. A good example would be the Diplomatic Revolution which, as far as Horn is concerned, was caused as much by Newcastle as by Kaunitz or any other ministers.[34] Yet Newcastle cannot be isolated in the problems that arose from British attempts to find peace and end their various conflicts. As noted above, Bute appears culpable in placing too much faith in the understanding of Prussian ministers in London, Andreas Ludwig Michell and Baron Knyphausen. Michell had been distrusted by Mitchell for some time past, but Knyphausen's motivations are not so clear. It is possible that, as Doran argues, Pitt's removal in October 1761 permanently shook Frederick's faith in British support and indeed, their political stability.[35]

Did Pitt's resignation convince Frederick that Britain could not be depended upon? According to Jeremy Black, Britain's 'government unity' had been lost by the resignation of Pitt in late 1761. Certainly, as Black notes, Pitt had been a vocal proponent of continental intervention and support for Germany.[36] Pitt himself had earlier told Mitchell that Frederick 'stands [as] the unshaken bulwark of Europe, against the most powerful and malignant confederacy, that ever yet has threatened the independence of mankind'.[37] Frederick had for some years been sensible of Pitt's strong stance in his favour, directly through letters and as conveyed to him through Mitchell.[38] In government in the 1750s, Pitt had certainly been one whom Mitchell could have used to maintain Frederick's happiness with his British ally.[39] But in 1761, Pitt's resignation allowed George III to alter his policy toward the continent and to redirect his attention to

---

[32] *Ibid.*, pp. 87-88.
[33] George III to Bute, 22 October 1762, in Sedgwick, ed, *Letters of George III to Lord Bute*, p. 149.
[34] D. B. Horn, 'The Duke of Newcastle and the origins of the Diplomatic Revolution', in J. H. Elliott and H. G. Koenigsberger, ed, *The diversity of history: Essays in honour of Sir Herbert Butterfield* (London, 1970), p. 267.
[35] Doran, *Andrew Mitchell*, pp. 385-386.
[36] Black, *Parliament and foreign policy*, pp. 99-100.
[37] Pitt to Mitchell, 31 March 1757, in W. Stanhope and J. H. Pringle, eds, *Correspondence of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham*, Vol. 1 (London, 1838), p. 226.
[38] See for example the letter from Pitt to Frederick, draft, January 1759; Mitchell to Pitt, 8 January 1759; and Mitchell to Pitt, 20 May 1759, where Frederick said 'I am in no danger [of being left out of a treaty]; Mr. Pitt is an honest man and firm; my interests are safe in his hands', in *Ibid.*, pp. 393-394, 401-402, 407-408.
[39] Mitchell had written in 1757 congratulating Pitt as 'an old friend' on his elevation to 'the high office, to which his Majesty has been pleased to call you; which, as I know you will fill with ability, dignity, and probity, I heartily wish you may long enjoy'. Pitt replied that Mitchell's sentiment was 'the very pleasing and most valuable part of your letter, where, in most obliging expressions, you mention old acquaintance and friendship. I shall have a particular pleasure in cultivating the honour of your kind remembrance and desire you will remain assured, that no one is with more truth and regard than myself, dear Sir, your most obedient, and most humble servant'. See letters Mitchell to Pitt, 12 March 1757, and Pitt to Mitchell, 31 March 1757, in Stanhope and Pringle, eds, *Correspondence of William Pitt*, Vol. 3, pp. 224-227.

maritime policies.[40] The British ministry were also deprived of Mitchell's personal, on-the-spot reports because he was away from Frederick over this period. Pitt finally returned to government in 1766 and his 'first political objective' was settling a 'triple alliance' between Britain, Prussia and Russia.[41] Prior to setting out back to Berlin in that year, Mitchell had told Pitt that 'I am persuaded the first question that will be put to me by the King of Prussia, will be, 'when did you see Mr. Pitt, my faithful and steady friend?''.[42] Before his interview with Frederick, Mitchell told Pitt that he was worried that the upheavals in British politics during the Seven Years War 'may influence [Frederick] to be shy with Great Britain' but that Frederick 'has never opened himself to me upon that head'.[43] Mitchell reported back to Pitt after his interview with Frederick. He informed Pitt that his speculations upon the political point had been correct. Mitchell told Pitt that, among other reasons, Frederick said that the 'treatment he had met with from us when the late peace was made' made him reluctant to make new agreements, and that Frederick 'talked of the instability of our measures and sudden changes in our administrations, which made it almost impossible to transact business with us with any sort of certainty'.[44] Mitchell added that in order to convince Frederick, he had shown him Pitt's private letter that he had written to Mitchell, to show 'that now, by your Lordship's taking a share in government, the cause of his distrust was taken away, and therefore his diffidence ought to cease &c. He answered 'I fear my friend has hurt himself by accepting of a peerage at this time''.[45] Mitchell carried on telling Pitt how he had expounded upon Britain's confidence in Pitt, and that Frederick should take this as a sign of positive change in Britain. Pitt, Mitchell asserted to Frederick, had returned Britain to its senses. Mitchell reminded Frederick that even military officers cannot show their full lustre until the desperate time calls for it. He told Pitt of Frederick's response: 'The King smiled, and said 'I understand your allusion, and hope it will be so''.[46] In a meeting in late 1766 Mitchell gained further comment from Frederick regarding Pitt. In a private capacity, Frederick told Mitchell that 'I have a very high opinion of Lord Chatham, and great confidence in him; but what assurances can you give me, that he has power, and will continue in office?'. Mitchell could only convey Pitt's public popularity, which had no influence with Frederick.[47] Returning to the reasons for the decay in Prussian-British relations from 1761-1762 (following Pitt's resignation), there seems to be no firm evidence of Frederick's motivations, but some of them may be surmised.

---

[40] Nick Harding, *Hanover and the British empire, 1700-1837* (Woodbridge, 2007), p. 146.
[41] Scott, *British foreign policy*, p. 1.
[42] Mitchell to Pitt, 11 April 1766, in W. Stanhope and J. H. Pringle, eds, *Correspondence of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham*, Vol. 2 (London, 1838), p. 410.
[43] Mitchell to Pitt, 21 August 1766, in W. Stanhope and J. H. Pringle, eds, *Correspondence of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham*, Vol. 3 (London, 1839), p. 48.
[44] Mitchell to Pitt, date unknown [probably August 1766], cf. *Ibid.*, pp. 67-70. Mitchell later reflected that this moment was decisive, and might have convinced Frederick that Britain was not where his best interests lay. 'When I made that proposal on the part of his Majesty to the King of Prussia, he received it coldly, and declined, for reasons best known to himself, entering into any connections with our Court. Since which period I have been in no degree of confidence either with his Prussian Majesty or his Ministers…'. See Mitchell to the earl of Harcourt, 14 March 1769, in Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, p. 380.
[45] Mitchell to Pitt, 17 September 1766, in Stanhope and Pringle, eds, *Correspondence of William Pitt*, p. 70.
[46] *Ibid.*, p. 71.
[47] Mitchell to Pitt, 6 December 1766, in *Ibid.*, p. 142.

There is some suggestion that Frederick, convinced of Britain's prioritisation of the war in North America, combined this with his natural suspicion of Bute to conclude that, perhaps, his security lay with Russia rather than Britain.[48] Removed as he had been from Mitchell's personal interests and arguments since May 1761, Frederick might have seen newer paths open to him which might have been prevented had Mitchell been on hand to make Britain's arguments. Intercepted communications between Frederick and his ministers in London did not eliminate the possibility that Frederick saw his future with Russia, and Jeremy Black has argued that British diplomats recognised the important change in focus from the Pitt ministry to that which succeeded him.[49] Pitt's return to power in 1766 was nearly simultaneous with Mitchell's return to Prussia. At that time, Pitt wrote to Mitchell on the task facing the latter in Prussia. He noted that he had arranged for Britain's new ambassador to St Petersburg, Hans Stanley, to stop at Prussia and to attempt to convince Frederick of the security that making an alliance with Britain would provide. Pitt's elaboration of the reasons for reforming an alliance with Prussia highlight the deterioration in the British-Prussian relationship since his departure.[50]

Another scholar has posited the belief that 1763, not 1762, was the key year in which Frederick decided to pursue his own foreign policy and decisively break with Britain.[51] This would mean that the lack of Mitchell's personal presence between May 1761 and May 1762 was perhaps not so crucial. Part of the problem perhaps also lay in the reality that Frederick never fundamentally understood Britain's conception of foreign powers and territories. This can be combined with two further factors, as noted by Hamish Scott, with which Frederick would have been aware: that is, the lack of any coherent British foreign policy after 1763, which provided the opportunity for Frederick to seek security elsewhere; and his awareness that, by defending Prussia against France, Austria, and Russia, the Prussian state had firmly entered the realm of the great powers.[52] For Schweizer, Frederick constantly complained about Britain's lack of prioritisation of the continent; for Britain, Frederick was merely a cog in the range of powers against France.[53] It is important, however, to add some clarity to what Frederick's ministers actually reported to him if the question of Frederick's aims and understandings in diplomacy are to be better understood.

The essential structure of Frederick's diplomatic corps was a collection of agents posted abroad to collect information.[54] The failure of Frederick to trust them to conduct negotiations or to take decisive actions slowed Prussian diplomacy, but also made it a case of depending upon faithful reporting: if reports happened to be misread or misinterpreted, this could have a strong influence on Frederick's subsequent actions. Mitchell had made the point clear in March 1762. He told Bute that Frederick would not give *carte*

[48] Horst Dippel, 'Prussia's English policy after the Seven Years' War', *Central European History*, 4 (1971), pp. 199-200.
[49] Jeremy Black, *Debating foreign policy in eighteenth-century Britain* (Farnham and Burlington, 2011), pp. 163-164.
[50] William Pitt to Andrew Mitchell, 8 August 1766, in Stanhope and Pringle, eds, *Correspondence of William Pitt*, pp. 29-32.

[51] Ritter, *Frederick the Great*, p. 186.
[52] Scott, *British foreign policy*, pp. 11; 31.
[53] Schweizer, *Frederick the Great*, p. 43.
[54] Scott, 'Prussia's royal foreign minister', p. 521.

blanche to any diplomat, because 'that is a degree of trust and confidence the King of Prussia is incapable of bestowing on any man living, even the most able and experienced minister, much less on a young man just entered upon business'.[55] Moreover, Frederick was keen to ensure Prussia was given the same attention as the established powers when it came to British diplomacy, something that he may have understood Bute to be neglecting.[56] Knyphausen and Michell obtained confirmation that Britain had made overtures to Austria, but only for soundings of peace related to possibly preventing a growth of the Bourbon compact in Spain. It appears, however, that Bute was playing two games – one in which he attempted to manage Britain's position for or against France and Spain, and one in which he wanted to mitigate the possible negative outcome of that situation by possibly abandoning Prussia. He wrote to Newcastle that 'if we have a war with Spain we must give up the German war; it is impossible to carry on both'.[57] In addition, Bute made it clear to Joseph Yorke in The Hague that Prussia might be abandoned to the mercy of her enemies. 'The critical minute seems approaching in which the option must be made of continuing the German war … or of withdrawing our troops and leaving the King's electoral dominions and the princes, his allies, to make the best terms possible with the enemy'.[58] Bute cemented his shift in mindset a few days later when he wrote that 'perhaps Austria could be awakened from a dangerous lethargy to a Remembrance and imitation of that glorious Stand, which she formerly made in conjunction with England…'.[59] Yet Bute became indignant some time later when he attempted to clarify his intentions to Mitchell in Prussia. He felt that the Prussian envoys had misrepresented his intentions, and subsequently attempted to show them to Frederick (through Mitchell) in their 'true light'. Bute was infuriated over what he was as manipulation of the situation and the events by Prussian diplomats.[60]

Mitchell emphasised to Bute in February 1762 the necessity of getting to Frederick directly, particularly so as Mitchell had not personally seen Frederick for some time. If it were left to go through his diplomats, Mitchell argued, there would be no progress. Drawing on previous examples, Mitchell wrote that the King's ministers 'owned that they could not venture to write nor speak to their master upon that subject; and I find the same timidity still continues, for though they are convinced of the utility of what I have proposed, they are deaf to all representations'.[61] Mitchell also did his utmost to persuade Bute that Frederick would read Britain's diplomatic policy in his own way, and this might have detrimental effects on their alliance. Speaking of a possible Russo-Prussian peace, Mitchell said that:

---

[55] Mitchell to Bute, 17 March 1762, in Bisset, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, p. 275.
[56] For Frederick's standing on ceremony and protocol, see Scott, 'Prussia's royal foreign minister', p. 520.
[57] Schweizer, *Frederick the Great*, p. 143.
[58] Bute to Yorke, 8 January 1762, cf. *Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence*, Vol. 22, p. 2n11.
[59] Bute to Yorke, 12 January 1762, cf. Carol S. Leonard, *Reform and regicide: The reign of Peter III of Russia* (Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1993), p. 197n120.
[60] Schweizer, 'Lord Bute', pp. 90-91.
[61] Mitchell to Bute, 23 February 1762, in Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, p. 261.

> I am inclined to think that this peace exists only in the King of Prussia's imagination, which is indeed fruitfull and lively, and affords him much comfort by overlooking or at least diminishing every obstacle and difficulty which might oppose or retard the accomplishment of his wishes.[62]

Mitchell's observations on Frederick's character continued to appear in his letters to Bute in 1762, seemingly without warnings being heeded. If Bute had planned to compensate Frederick for the potential loss of Silesia, he would be sadly mistaken. Mitchell told Bute that:

> The knowledge I have of the King of Prussia's temper, and of his caprices, induces me to write with this freedom; and I believe nothing will more disgust that monarch than if he should imagine himself to be treated as a pecuniary dependant. He may, for a time, seem to dissemble, but he will not easily forget; and the first fair opportunity that offers, he will not fail to take his revenge, even at the expense of his real interest.[63]

Between Mitchell's urgings of caution over Frederick's 'imagination' and his 'caprice', the developing saga of British diplomacy was worsening, when the Russian Prince Galitzin reported to Peter III that, in a meeting with Bute, the latter had made substantial promises to Russia and also was willing to wash his hands of Frederick and Prussia to secure terms with Russia. The incident is fully outlined in Karl Schweizer and Carol Leonard's comprehensive article on this topic.[64] The substance of the affair needs to be briefly covered here, in order to further our investigation over the consequences for Mitchell, which of course were not Schweizer and Leonard's priority.

Parts of the incident have been contextualised above.[65] Newcastle and Bute pursued a policy of allying Britain once more with Austria. Their priority was partially to reduce subsidy payments to Prussia, and when Peter III ascended the Russian throne, it became clearer that Prussia might not be in the peril it once was. To combat the potential of a Bourbon Family Compact, Britain had also attempted to find peace with France. The failure of that latter initiative still left Britain wishing to ally with the Austrians and the Dutch. Possibly also bringing Russia into this alliance was then a priority for Bute and Newcastle. However,

---

[62] Mitchell to Bute, 17 March 1762, in *Ibid.*, p. 275.
[63] Mitchell to Bute, 25 March 1762, in *Ibid.*, pp. 279-280. Schweizer also notes the insult with which Frederick perceived Britain's purely monetary assistance. See Schweizer, *Frederick the Great*, p. 149.
[64] Schweizer and Leonard, 'Britain, Prussia, Russia, and the Galitzin letter', pp. 531-556.
[65] This paragraph draws from Schweizer's writing on this issue, which is drawn from a survey of published and unpublished evidence and which is systematic in its speculations and conclusions. See Schweizer, *Frederick the Great*, Chapter 10.

Bute's meeting with Galitzin, held on 6 February 1762, had far reaching consequences for the continental alliance alignments. According to Galitzin, Bute said that he wanted the new czar's support and that Prussia must surely make some concessions for peace, which would bring about a new compact between Russia, Austria, and Britain. Bute's report of his interview with Galitzin does not match a report that Galitzin made, and an extract of the latter was sent from St Petersburg to Frederick in Prussia. In that extract, according to Schweizer, serious discrepancies arise over the conversation had between Bute and Galitzin – discrepancies which ultimately confirmed Frederick in his suspicion of Bute and Britain. In covering this issue, Schweizer suggests that Mitchell, while receiving long instructions from Bute, was probably never fully apprised of Bute's motivations and the directions of his diplomatic projects.[66] This is all the more accurate when considering Mitchell's removal from direct conversations with Frederick between May 1761 and May 1762.

The first time that Mitchell mentions Galitzin's supposed manipulations of Bute is when Mitchell himself wrote to Bute in early May 1762. He had been read a copy of the 'extract', sent via St Petersburg, in which words were imputed to Bute (outlined above) which in effect alleged that Bute intended to bring Prussia to a cession of territory and a settlement favourable to Russia and Austria. Mitchell was read the letter by Finckenstein, and not permitted to take notes. Mitchell told Bute that he believed 'the whole was an ill-intentioned fiction; that I believed your Lordship [Bute] never had any such conversation'. Still uninformed as to Bute's larger aims, Mitchell could do nothing but assert this misunderstanding, or even complete error, in the Galitzin report possessed by Finckenstein.[67] Mitchell added that, in his mind, Galitzin could not be trusted, and was an inveterate supporter of France and Austria (as Galitzin's former employer, the Empress Elizabeth, had been). Most importantly, Mitchell told Bute that 'I am informed his Prussian Majesty, upon first receiving this intelligence, was almost furious, and to this moment cannot talk with temper upon the subject'.[68] A week later, Mitchell was in Breslau, the first time he had seen Frederick for a year, and though Frederick received him, he perceived a tangible shift in Frederick's demeanour. Mitchell was probably unaware that Frederick had just signed a momentous peace with Russia five days earlier.[69]

> I pay my court almost daily to the King of Prussia, and am always received with great civility; but I see he industriously avoids talking of affairs, and his minister, Count Finckenstein, with whom I was in habits of friendship and confidence, follows his master's example, perhaps by express order, and behaves to me with as much reservedness as if we were absolute strangers.[70]

[66] Schweizer, *Frederick the Great*, p. 245.
[67] Doran, *Andrew Mitchell*, p. 307.
[68] Mitchell to Bute, 3 May 1762, in Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, pp. 287-288.
[69] Scott, *The birth of a great power system*, p. 105.
[70] Mitchell to Bute, 9 May 1762, in Bisset ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, p. 289.

Mitchell thought he made progress in steering Frederick away from deceptive and untruthful reports, but found Frederick well-informed and firmly entrenched in his views.[71] George III read Mitchell's letters on the subject – as he did with all diplomatic correspondence[72] - and told Bute that Frederick's reaction 'proves the proneness of the K. of Prussia ever to receive suspicions, and the blackness of his character in so easily giving way to what must be in every important man's eyes appear incredible; who has been the rascal to invent this deserves any punishment'.[73] Bute could do nothing to stop the continued coming together of Prussia and Russia. He wrote to Mitchell, as a form of vindication, his account of the cutting of the Prussian subsidy and his own side of the Galitzin incident. In short, he told Mitchell, 'I see no resemblance in [Galitzin's] account to my real conversation with Prince Galitzin', and speculated a number of reasons for this deliberate misrepresentation of his views, most important of which was Galitzin's 'known attachment to the Court of Vienna'.[74] Bute's appeals and vindications could not change events. What is most pertinent to this coverage of the Galitzin letter is that Galtizin seems to have impugned Mitchell in the report that made its way to Frederick in Prussia. The report had said that Bute had written to Mitchell to press for a possible peace negotiation – which indeed he had – but frames this as a condescending, benevolent effort on the part of Britain to save Frederick from his 'delusion'. The following sentences cannot have failed to infuriate Frederick, as Mitchell noted. The important question is whether Frederick now believed that Mitchell sought to betray him in some way? Galitzin alleges that Bute's intriguing with Mitchell had been some six weeks in the planning (this written on 26 January 1762) and that it was well known in London that Frederick

> … cannot delude himself that he will receive peace without significant concession of his territories, at his expense, and in addition, it is already close to six weeks ago that Count Bute … wrote to Mitchell … to make such a declaration, and commanded him to declare to the Prussian ministry that it is now time to discuss this seriously … Since Count Bute … is informed about the great inclination of [Peter III] toward peace, which the Prussian king will find useful in deluding himself with chimerical hopes, which Count Bute is so beyond, since he sees all these circumstances objectively and positively and not in the way of the Prussian ministers, for whom it is natural, like a drowning man, to grasp on to the slightest thing in hopes of being saved.[75]

[71] Schweizer, 'Lord Bute', pp. 92-94.
[72] Scott, *British foreign policy*, p. 16.
[73] George III to Bute, 17 May 1762, in Sedgwick, ed, *Letters*, p. 107. The rascal, as Sedgwick notes, was Galitzin.
[74] Bute to Mitchell, 26 May 1762, in Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, p. 299.
[75] Galitzin to Vorontsov, 6 February/26 January 1762, cf. Schweizer and Leonard, 'Britain, Prussia, Russia, and the Galitzin letter', p. 554.

While Frederick was soon apprised of Galitzin's allegiances, he did not change his mind about the new direction of his policy and the termination of his trust in Britain. He was furious with Bute, and furious with his own envoys for their incompetence.[76] As Scott has noted, there perhaps needs to be an element of pragmatism applied to the Bute-Frederick situation, and the larger Britain-Prussia diplomatic breakdown. Scott sees the breakdown as an inevitable end to a partnership that was only ever based on circumstance, and that Bute's mishandling of the diplomatic situation provided an opportunistic context for Frederick to distance himself from Britain. As Scott notes, in the eyes of Frederick, 'had Lord Bute never existed, it would have been necessary to invent him'.[77] Does it stand to reason that he exempted Mitchell, given Galitzin's account above? Does it also stand, that he exempted Mitchell given all the fingers pointed at his own diplomats? The argument I suggest here is that it was during this breach of his trust that Frederick severed his intellectual bonds with Mitchell, but also lost his belief that Mitchell was working for the benefit of Prussia as well as Britain. It perhaps exacerbated the diplomatic isolation of Britain, Prussia and Russia – the main players in this controversy – which in turn exacerbated fear and uncertainty in their political interactions.[78]

iv. 1762 Part II: Explaining the shift in Mitchell and Frederick's friendship

Andrew Mitchell had battled ill health for the preceding two or three years, seemingly due to the fatigue of campaigning for the six years from 1756. When news began to filter through to him of the rapidly evolving diplomatic situation between Britain, Prussia, and Russia (specifically, the gathering closeness of the latter two), Mitchell wrote a frank letter to fellow diplomat, the Scot Robert Keith (Senior) in St Petersburg. Mitchell felt free to express to Keith his disgust at the ending of Britain's Prussian subsidy, his absolutely jaded mindset, his lack of optimism, and his resignation about the future of his role in Prussia and, possibly, at home in Britain. The italicised section in this middle of the quote I have translated from French (the Latin belongs to Mitchell).

> The news, your own letters will give you, and I fancy it will be as unpalatable to you as it is to me. We must, however, obey, and do our best; we are indeed the *servi servorum*, the beasts of burden that must go as they are driven. *I am tired of this job; but thoughtful considerations prevent me from taking any further resolution. Help me, my dear friend, with your advice; I miss my health, and the situation of affairs overwhelms me with sadness* … I have one solid comfort in the midst of my most

[76] Schweizer, *Frederick the Great*, p. 267.
[77] Scott's analysis of the relationship of Britain and Prussia after the Seven Years' War can be found in Scott, *British foreign policy*, pp. 33-36.
[78] Scott, *Emergence of the eastern powers*, p. 103.

> distressful situation; which is, that I have done my duty fairly, honestly, and freely, without consulting to please, or acquire friends. I have sacrificed my ambition to the public weal. I have, in some measure, regained the confidence of the hero, with whom I live; and he hears from me what, perhaps, he would not have patience to do from another. This is, in truth, the reason why I remain here. I do not think it impossible that I may be recalled, though I have not asked for it. I shall retire with pleasure, for I am well able to justify everything I have done. I heartily wish every man concerned with public business were in the same happy situation. I have profited of this opportunity to pour out my soul to you; it affords me consolation, and I have only to desire that when you have read this letter, you will commit it to the flames…[79]

This extraordinary letter truly did lay bare Mitchell's thoughts to Keith. It also shows something of the hardships, concerns and personal reflections – in addition to the stress of working for the disorganised ministry and its confused ambitions at home – that Mitchell had experienced since May 1761, the last time he personally saw Frederick. He did not see him again until late April 1762, when he travelled to Breslau to make representations to Frederick on behalf of Bute. At the time of writing the above letter in June 1762, the situation had deteriorated from the optimism of the beginning of the year. On 10 January 1762, Frederick had written to Mitchell hoping for his health to improve, and praising the diplomat for his fortitude and character.[80] Mitchell's friends also knew of his poor health. Murdoch wrote that they had not written Mitchell due to the 'the distress we have long been in from accounts of your bad health', but that they were now told Mitchell had improved.[81]

The death of the Russian Empress Elizabeth afforded a complete change in the diplomatic alignments of Europe. Thiébault recorded that Elizabeth's death was 'a circumstance which may be considered as one of the miraculous and unexpected events that affected the salvation of Frederick'.[82] Scott concurs that 'in the final analysis, only the Empress Elizabeth's death at the very beginning of 1762 may have saved Prussia from defeat and the threat of destruction'.[83]

Immediately Mitchell had recognised the new Emperor Peter III's interests in good relations with Prussia, and, he believed, England.[84] Many letters sent in the dying days of January 1762 show that Mitchell believed that 'I cannot help considering this great and unexpected event [the death of the Empress] as an

---

[79] Andrew Mitchell to Robert Keith, 9 June 1762, in Mrs Gillespie Smyth, ed, *Memoirs and Correspondence of Sir Robert Murray Keith, K. B., Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at the courts of Dresden, Copenhagen, and Vienna, from 1769 to 1792*, Vol. 1 (London, 1849), pp. 36-38. The French italicisation: *Je suis las de mon s- métier; mais des considerations réfléches m'empêchant de prendre encore aucune resolution subite. Aidez moi, je vous prie, mon cher ami, de vos conseils; la santé me manqué, et la situation des affaires m'accable de tristesse.*
[80] Frederick to Mitchell, 10 January 1762, in Bisset, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, p. 242.
[81] Murdoch to Mitchell, 13 February 1762, BL Add MS 6840, f. 50.
[82] Thiébault, *Original anecdotes*, Vol. 2, p. 229.
[83] Scott, *Birth of a great power system*, p. 106.
[84] Mitchell to Bute, 30 January 1762, in *Ibid.*, p. 243.

indication that Providence is resolved, even in the last hour, to save the King of Prussia'.[85] Happiness, however, quickly turned to wariness, compounded more so by the concerns over Frederick's choice of diplomats to Russia, and the instructions that might be given to those diplomats. Mitchell told Keith that Frederick was 'making a sort of mystery of the person or persons he intends to send' to Russia. The reason, Mitchell believed, was that one of those chosen was Major-General Lentulus, who Mitchell believed to be a 'very weak, very vain, and very indiscreet' man, 'but, which is worst of all, a servile flatterer, and capable of reporting to his master the greatest falsehoods'.[86] The other to be sent was Baron Goltz, a man respected by Mitchell and held in good regard by him.

How honest was Frederick with Mitchell and Britain at this point?[87] It seems that Frederick himself was uncertain about the future of the war and the new balance of alliances that might result from Peter III's accession. It would not have been out of character for Frederick to dissemble to Mitchell about his intentions but, crucially, Mitchell was also not by Frederick's side at this important time. Ill-health had kept Mitchell from campaigning with Frederick for some time. The last he had seen Frederick was at Meissen in May 1761, when Frederick left for Silesia and Mitchell stayed behind. Mitchell then went to Magdeburg, the temporary home of the Prussian court and civil administration, and where he was based until he travelled to Breslau to meet Frederick on 29 April 1762.[88] Thus nearly a full year passed where Mitchell languished in ill-health and uncertainty, reporting home what he could ascertain from letters from Frederick and his commanders.[89] But even in April 1762 Frederick was writing enquiring after Mitchell's health, and lamenting his poor situation between the major powers to 'my dear Mr Mitchell'.[90] However, evidence suggests that his intentions or commitments had been questioned by Frederick's inner circle, notably, by his close and secretive secretary Eichel, since at least 1760. When cut off from Frederick on campaign in 1760, Eichel had written to Finckenstein that it was pointless for Mitchell to remain so far away in Glogau. He questioned Mitchell's commitment, but also, why he had only written to Frederick once in a number of months.[91]

---

[85] Mitchell to Bute, 31 January 1762, in *Ibid.*, p. 256.
[86] Mitchell to Keith, 10 February 1762, in *Ibid.*, p. 259.
[87] Shiru Lim has recently published a lengthy investigation on discussions of truth between Frederick and d'Alembert. In this paper, Lim demonstrates d'Alembert's pressing of Frederick to commit to a philosophical truth, and involved lengthy discussions on whether it was useful to deceive 'the people' as a ruler, and whether this could be reconciled with true philosophy. As Lim notes, their discussions showed, at the outset, Frederick's commitment to the 'importance of refining society's mores', while d'Alembert 'prioritised upholding the truth'. (370). Frederick's commitment to Stoicism as his favoured philosophy allowed d'Alembert to force Frederick to confront his ideals as a philosopher king, culminating in Frederick allowing the Berlin Academy to make their prize question for 1780 as follows: 'Is it useful to deceive the people?'. However, as Lim notes, Frederick never relinquished his fear that the people were animals, and that a practical deceit was necessary for political expediency. See Shiru Lim, 'Frederick the Great and Jean le Rond d'Alembert on philosophy, truth, and politics', *The Historical Journal,* 2 (2018), pp. 357-378.
[88] Schweizer, *Frederick the Great*, p. 297; Doran, *Andrew Mitchell*, p. 290.
[89] Bisset, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, pp. 229-230, where Mitchell writes from Meissen on 14 April, then Leipzig on 29 April 1761; Szabo, *The Seven Years War*, p. 336, who confirms that Frederick left Meissen for Silesia in early May 1761.
[90] Frederick to Mitchell, 17 April 1762, *Pol. Corr.*, Vol. 21, p. 373.
[91] Eichel to Finckenstein, 26 October 1760, *Pol. Corr*, Vol. 20, p. 34. It is possible Mitchell's silence was due to a number of factors, including dangerous roads, the movement of armies, or finding the best place for

Based in Magdeburg in 1761-62, Mitchell could only communicate via Finckenstein, while Frederick was farther away in Breslau and around Silesia. Patrick Doran has suggested that Mitchell's influence with Frederick had been on the wane since the removal of Pitt in 1761. Further, Doran argues that Mitchell's absence at the key moments of 1762 – the change of Russian ruler and the ending of the British subsidy to Prussia – fundamentally undermined Mitchell's relationship with Frederick for good.[92] However, this might be missing the point. The evidence emerging from the documents is that Mitchell could not have had any major bearing on Frederick's foreign policy at this point, and in any case, the immediate reactions of Frederick to Peter III's accession point to Frederick being prepared to make substantial promises (i.e., his non-intervention in Peter's designs on Holstein) to find peace with Russia.

As noted above, Mitchell might have been implicated by the Galitzin letter in what Frederick perceived to be a British betrayal of his gains during the war, and his chances for peace. The question posed in the previous section was, whether Frederick exempted Mitchell from blame or culpability in what he saw as a betrayal of his alliance with Britain? On the face of it, the question does not materially affect the larger diplomatic changes, especially after the ending of the Prussian subsidy. However, it is worth pursuing a line of enquiry into Mitchell's understanding of Frederick. It has been shown that Frederick certainly blamed Bute, and his own diplomats, for allowing (or in the case of Bute, forcing) the situation to deteriorate. Still, it was not all bad news for Frederick, with a *rapprochement* with Russia on the way. When the break with Britain became clearer in mid-1762, Frederick would go to great lengths to keep Mitchell away from a position to gather information, going so far as to hide from him the departure of more couriers to St Petersburg.[93] Mitchell, for his own part, was unhappy with Bute's handling of the entire debacle, and expressed this much to Finckenstein, effectively distancing himself from the actions of Bute. Apart from his disagreement with Bute's anti-continental policy, a view he shared with Keith,[94] Mitchell told Finckenstein that he abhorred Bute's acting against the rules of good faith, prudence, and politics.[95]

The most straightforward conclusion to all this was that Mitchell was attempting to distance himself from Bute on the grounds of principle, but also, for self-preservation in Berlin. To have any effect as a diplomat in Berlin – though it had been undermined and made largely worthless by the actions of his ministry – Mitchell realised that relations with Frederick were still the key. Doran gives his description of Mitchell as a man who saw out the remainder of his career in Berlin playing a distant part, fulfilling his duty, often without joy, but remaining nonetheless. However, this does not take into account his sense of his own achievement, and that he had long asked for recognition, marks of favour and royal approbation. In Doran's portrayal, Mitchell is left bereft without the friendship of Frederick.[96] I am suggesting here that

communications, all of which Frederick noted in a letter to Mitchell earlier that month. See Frederick to Mitchell, 5 October 1760, *Pol. Corr.*, Vol. 20, p. 11.
[92] Doran, *Andrew Mitchell*, pp. 385-386.
[93] *Ibid.*, p. 327.
[94] Schweizer and Leonard, 'Britain, Prussia, Russia', p. 544.
[95] Doran, *Andrew Mitchell*, p. 332.
[96] *Ibid.*, pp. 332-333.

Frederick was not the *causa causans* of Mitchell's diplomacy, which was actually rooted in a sense of service that did not need Frederick as its guiding star. Mitchell could, and did, make prudent and critical observations of post-war Prussia, and was keen to ensure his masters in London were aware of the strange place that, Mitchell felt, Prussia had become.

As noted above, he did not see Frederick for nearly a year, from May 1761 to April 1762. Scholars suggest that Mitchell was often passed over, used as a mere messenger, or even discussed with a view to recall, during 1762.[97] Several reasons are sometimes cited: Frederick often sent messages to his ministers in London without informing Mitchell of his positions; Mitchell's superiors in London were struggling to place an effective policy which Mitchell could work toward; and George III was so annoyed that Mitchell had left Frederick to write accusatory papers against Britain that he suggested Mitchell's recall.[98] Vicissitudes in Frederick's attitude toward Mitchell were vexing and becoming increasingly confusing. In May 1762, their personal relationship was still tangibly preserved – at the height of the tensions around British diplomatic mistakes, Frederick wrote to Mitchell that he lamented the latter's ill-health, that he valued Mitchell immensely, and most importantly, that he did not doubt Mitchell's sincerity in the latter's work concerning Frederick's reconciliation with Russia.[99] In the same month, Frederick wrote that 'I have no doubt of your good and honourable sentiment, my dear Mr. Mitchell. I could wish that everybody thought in the same manner; the world would be all the happier for it, and the men more virtuous'.[100] It was in almost the same moment that Frederick signed a valuable peace with Russia, on 5 May 1762, signed on the back of the accession of Peter III following the death of Empress Elizabeth on 5 January 1762.[101] The good will continued into July 1762 when Frederick again reiterated his 'esteem which I unalterably still hold for you, and how much your person is always agreeable to me'.[102] Their meetings in very early August were likewise frank and cordial,[103] on the level they had established since 1756, and in that month Frederick also took the opportunity of explaining his predicaments and, to his mind, his justifiable outrage to Mitchell. His wording still shows a great respect for Mitchell's comprehension of the situation and attempts to persuade Mitchell that he should use this penetration to influence affairs back home.

[97] George III was so incensed by Prussia's attitudes and printed statements on their political positions that he demanded to Bute that Britain either draft a very strong reply or 'perhaps a recall of our Minister [Mitchell]'. See George III to Bute, 22 October 1762, in Sedgwick, ed, *Letters from George III to Lord Bute*, p. 149. For Mitchell being used as a messenger, witness the diplomatic and personal exchanges between Bute and Frederick transmitted by Mitchell (and over his head) during 1762 in Doran, *Andrew Mitchell*, pp. 318-333.
[98] Doran, *Andrew Mitchell*, pp. 368-369, 372; Schweizer, 'Lord Bute', pp. 96-97. See also George III letter to Bute in above note.
[99] Frederick to Mitchell, 30 May 1762, *Pol. Corr.*, Vol. 21, p. 486.
[100] Cf. Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, p. 160.
[101] Scott, *The birth of a great power system*, p. 105.
[102] Frederick to Mitchell, 29 July 1762, *Pol. Corr.*, Vol. 22, p. 81.
[103] Mitchell to Grenville, 1 and 2 August 1762, *Pol. Corr.*, Vol. 22, pp. 100-103.

> The confidence I have always placed in your uprightness means that I cannot let this opportunity go by without asking you to reflect on the present situation of the affairs of England in Germany … It is only to you that I wanted to explain myself here on this subject, your penetration and your just and right feelings that I have always recognised in you, persuade me that you will not fail to make a good and proper use of it.[104]

Frederick continued to express terms of friendship to Mitchell, writing in November that irrespective of whether Mitchell joined with him then, or in Berlin, 'my feelings of esteem for you will remain, in the meantime, invariable, of which I beg you will be assured'.[105] It should also be noted that, according to Schweizer, Frederick conducted a systematic campaign to undermine Bute's ministry throughout 1762 and 1763, going so far as to promote printed pamphlets and to instruct his ministers in London to work with politicians who opposed Bute.[106] Despite this, there is no hint of a request to have Mitchell recalled, or an intimation that Mitchell's position was untenable, although it should be noted that the Convention of Westminster was still in place and Frederick would not have wished to compromise it.[107] On the first of January 1763 he wished Mitchell a speedy recovery and also good fortune for the new year,[108] and while in February 1763 Mitchell could not explain why Frederick neglected to give him news of the progress of the treaty with Austria,[109] Frederick soon after, once more, expressed sincerely his sentiments of appreciation and respect for Mitchell which, once more, he said, 'will never vary'.[110] Mitchell's health had indeed been very poor. Murdoch wrote at about the same time that

> the first news we had upon our return to the Country was that your life was despaired of: We have, thank God, had better accounts of late, but are still afraid that your constitution has been much impaired, and that it will required the use of mineral waters, and other alternatives, and abstracting yourself as much as possible from business, to restore you to your sound health.[111]

---

[104] Frederick to Mitchell, 15 August 1762, *Pol. Corr.*, Vol. 22, pp. 135-136. The French: La confiance que j'ai toujours mise en votre droiture, fait que je ne saurais laisser passer cette occasion, sans vous prier de faire réflexion sur la situation présente des affairs de l'Angleterre en Allemagne. ... Ce n'est qu'envers vous que j'ai voulu m'expliquer ici à ce sujet, votre pénétration et vos sentiments droits et justes que j'ai toujours reconnus à vous, me persuadent que vous ne laisserez pas d'en faire un bon et convenable usage.
[105] Frederick to Mitchell, 1 November 1762, *Pol. Corr.*, Vol. 22, pp. 300-301. Mes sentiments d'estime pour vous resteront, en attendant, invariables, dont je vous prie d'être assuré.
[106] Schweizer, *Frederick the Great*, p. 302.
[107] *Ibid.*, p. 303.
[108] Frederick to Mitchell, 1 January 1763, *Pol. Corr.*, Vol. 22, p. 430.
[109] Mitchell to Halifax, 17 February 1763, in Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, pp. 341-342.
[110] Frederick to Mitchell, 1 April 1763, *Pol. Corr.*, Vol. 23, p. 1.
[111] Murdoch to Mitchell, 4 April 1763, BL Add MS 6840, f. 52.

Murdoch went on to say that all his friends wanted to see Mitchell return safely home, but that they were aware of some obstacles to that end.

> I think you have been, and are, happy in your distance from this country; where party disputes, abuse, and scurrility rage to an excess that could never have been imagined, as the like has perhaps never been seen in this or any other nation.[112]

With considerable skill Mitchell convinced Frederick to recall the Prussian envoy Michell from London in May 1764, as demanded by the British government, and it was here that Frederick expressed anger at what he thought to be Britain's will to break with him personally. 'It is me, not my minister you are angry with', he told Mitchell in terminating the audience.[113] There is no hint of personal animosity here, though Frederick's attitude to Britain was quite clear. When Mitchell announced that he would soon be taking his leave of the court in Berlin in 1764, Lehndorff recorded in his diary that there was much conjecture surrounded his departure.[114]

Beginning in 1763, Mitchell expressed in his letters his strong criticisms of the rebuilding of Prussia under Frederick. Some of his criticisms were personal, others were of a more objective nature. In the next section these criticisms in Mitchell's letters will be elaborated upon, which, though there has been substantial work on Frederick's economic policies, have never been explored in any depth by scholars. Furthermore, evidence of Mitchell's continuing personal relationship with Frederick will show that, while Frederick had permanently altered his stance toward Britain, there is nothing to suggest that this applied to Mitchell personally. It begins to become clear that Mitchell's form of cultural diplomacy, which created a natural bond with Frederick, could perhaps not withstand the pressures of politics. It might be added that, in considering this proposal, several authors have noted the changed man Frederick became after the war: wearied, impatient, frequently ill.[115] These explanations mitigate the observations of Patrick Doran, who sees Frederick's attitude to Mitchell as in accordance with that he held toward Britain in general – that is, civil, but largely ignorant.[116]

v. Mitchell's letters on Frederick's policies and rule

[112] *Ibid.*
[113] 'Conversation of the King with the British Ambasssador Mitchell', *Pol. Corr.*, Vol. 23, pp. 368-369.
[114] Lehndorff, August 1764, in *Dreissig Jahre*, p. 408.
[115] Blanning, *Frederick the Great*, p. 259; Scott, '1763-1786', pp. 179-180.
[116] Doran, *Andrew Mitchell*, p. 374.

Prussia itself was affected to a great degree by being the scene of war from 1756 to 1763. It required extensive rebuilding both in terms of physical infrastructure and in terms of the revenue-raising ability to rebuild and to grow the state once more. While Mitchell saw the 'calamities of war' which had made the people furious and outraged,[117] he nevertheless was critical of Frederick's attempts to rebuild and the methods employed to do so. The need for revenues to rebuild must have been starkly obvious to many, including Mitchell. It has certainly preoccupied modern historians who see revenue raising and recovery of the population as the two main factors post-war.[118] As Hamish Scott notes, 'the almost total exhaustion of the Hohenzollern territories, which in effect prevented the King for playing the European role his victories had earned for him, was not generally evident to contemporaries, though it preoccupied Frederick himself'.[119] Frederick wrote that Prussia had lot around half a million people since 1756; that peasants had only their lives, and their 'miserable rags to cover their nakedness'; and that so many provinces presented 'a fatal spectacle' after the war that 'the situation of these provinces after the peace of Hubertusburg recalled that in which Brandenburg was found after the end of the famous Thirty Years' War'.[120] While it would be uncharacteristic of Mitchell to say he blamed Frederick for the state of Prussia, Mitchell's criticisms certainly highlight what he perceived to be Frederick's mismanagement of rebuilding efforts, and in particular his reliance on unskilled or avaricious men.

While Frederick wrote letters of friendship to Mitchell, the latter was not hesitant to tell his employers at home about what he saw as the ill-considered initiatives Frederick was undertaking to raise revenue and rebuild his kingdom and his treasury.[121] Mitchell wrote his criticisms of Frederick in both official dispatches and in private letters. It is unclear whether Frederick was aware of his criticisms, but there is no evidence that Mitchell's letters were being opened or read by Prussians. Mitchell criticised the lottery scheme, run by Antonio di Calzabigi, who, according to Mitchell, was not only a liar (he claimed that the King of England supported his schemes) but ran a lottery scheme which was 'a manifest fraud, and greatly disadvantageous to those who are weak to risk money'. In the same letter, Mitchell criticised Frederick's declaration of no further taxes, which was made hollow by his debasement of the coinage, and which, all in all, Mitchell felt to be driven by 'vanity, fraud, and avarice'.[122] These issues touched Mitchell's sense of morality and sound leadership, qualities he had come to see in Frederick in his early career, and which he now felt were absent in the King.

---

[117] Mitchell to unknown, 18 April 1763, in Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, pp. 345-346.
[118] Christopher Clark, *Iron Kingdom: The rise and downfall of Prussia, 1600-1947* (Cambridge, MA, 2006), pp. 212-213; Florian Schui, 'Taxpayer opposition and fiscal reform in Prussia, c. 1766-1787', *Historical Journal*, 54 (2011), pp. 371-399.
[119] Scott, *Birth of a great power system*, p. 147.
[120] Frederick II of Prussia, 'Memoirs since the peace of Hubertsbourg 1763, until the end of the partition of Poland, 1775', in *Oeuvres*, Vol. 6, pp. 82-83.
[121] An excellent survey of Frederick's economic policies can be found in W. O. Henderson, *Studies in the economic policy of Frederick the Great* (London, 1963).
[122] Mitchell to Weston, 5 March 1763, in Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, p. 343.

The debasement of the coinage was problematic for Mitchell because it did not discriminate – wealthy merchants and poor peasantry all suffered with the debasement, which effectively reduced their incomes and savings by between one and two thirds.[123] 'Nothing the King ever did has so much disgusted and alienated the affections of his people as the rash and inconsiderate steps he has taken with regard to the coin' Mitchell wrote in April 1763. Indeed, it seemed that Frederick had lost the affections of many of his people. Berlin, particularly alienated by him, had been a place that Frederick had utilised in large part to fund the campaigns of the war but about which, on his return after the war, he confessed disillusion and disinterest. Mitchell noted the hostility with which common Berliners regarded Frederick, and although fingers were pointed at Jews or others who had gained from the war, there was certainly an awareness of the flaws in Frederick's policies.[124]

Some specific examples of Mitchell's criticism are due here. The *Régie*, as a regime of tax collection in which Frederick empowered French tax collectors to raise revenue, overseeing a Prussian workforce of collectors, proved effective but unpopular.[125] Though the *Régie* was unpopular, its fiscal success was indisputable, considering that revenues in 1786 were three times those of 1740. As Scott notes, these measures 'all involved an intensification of state control and, in many cases, more personal initiative or scrutiny by Prussia's king'.[126] Other areas where there was a perceptible French influence were in the efforts to create tobacco farms and an accompanying royal monopoly, something for which Frederick received French offers of assistance.[127] The scheme was to be run by Frenchmen with Berlin academicians such as Count Röder to assist.[128]

Why was Mitchell so surprised with the initiatives Frederick was putting into place? Certainly the differences in political culture between Britain and Prussia – between parliamentary monarchy and absolute rule – were clear to him, though I have obtained no direct comment by Mitchell on Frederick's absolutism. The apparent cultural difference was exacerbated by the increasing 'political marginalisation' of Britain after the Seven Years War.[129] However, there were not a great many precedents for rebuilding a kingdom so devastated by war, particularly not in Mitchell's lifetime. His criticisms of Frederick are laced with comments about the monarch's personality, his personal greed, ignorance, or lack of understanding of the problems facing many people. Could it be that he was bitter to no longer be the trusted diplomat to Frederick? It did not seem to be in any way personal that Frederick pulled back from much of the day-to-day foreign policy that dominated the war years. Frederick had clearly stated his position (particularly post-war) that the initiatives of individual areas of his kingdom were to be reduced or cut out altogether, and that as much as possible of the direction of state would now go directly through his prerogative and

[123] Blanning, *Frederick the Great*, p. 425.
[124] MacDonogh, *Frederick the Great*, p. 320.
[125] Blanning, *Frederick the Great*, pp. 427-429.
[126] Scott, '1763-1786', p. 197.
[127] Burnet to Mitchell, 4 May 1765, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Kemnay, Bundle 85.
[128] Burnet to Mitchell, 7 May 1765, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Kemnay, Bundle 85.
[129] Scott, *Emergence of the eastern powers*, p. 137.

approval.[130] Horn notes the integral control Frederick held in his determination to revitalise the economy, which had the flow-on effect of weakening the General Directory, which had previously controlled many state affairs. Frederick's single-mindedness led to this increasing centralisation of almost all important decision-making powers.[131] Another possible explanation is that Mitchell was somehow resentful of the rising power of Prussia.

It was clear that Frederick's main goal was to make Prussia a great power.[132] Having seen the ravages of war, perhaps an explanation for Mitchell's cutting remarks is that he felt they would ultimately drive Prussia toward another conflict. Brendan Simms has explained that Britain's policy in the eighteenth century was to maintain a balance of power on the continent, never overcommitting Britain but also never leaving it isolated.[133] Perhaps it was this approach that instinctively resonated with Mitchell. As Ritter has explained, Frederick pursued policies that, while not popular, were aimed at increasing his state's power. 'If we wish to understand Frederick's actions in the economic sphere', Ritter writes, 'we must remember that like mercantilist policies in general they were less concerned with raising the economic well-being of the population – which was to be the first goal of the liberal age – than with increasing the power of the state'.[134] It was not only Frederick, but the rulers of many European states, who realised that robust internal systems were strongly related to their power abroad.[135]

Mitchell had seen the best of Frederick and now, after the war, he felt he was seeing the worst. This conflict was something he could not reconcile in his mind. But if Mitchell was critical of Frederick's policies from the standpoint of 'enlightenment' – and Frederick did use the metaphors of *lumière* and its plural *lumières* often in the context of Enlightenment and his own views[136] – then he did not explicitly label it as such. Mitchell made no direct comparisons between a pre-war and a post-war Frederick, or made any explicit comment on how Frederick might have become something other than what he had seen in 1756. Neither did he specifically not the religious tolerance for which Frederick was so praised. Instead, Mitchell's letters reveal the problem of how to reconcile his image of a Protestant warrior king, recently victorious against all odds, with a man who could then be so apparently oppressive of his people. Tim Blanning has highlighted what may have been very apparent to a cultured, 'enlightened' man like Mitchell: that 'all the policies pursued by Frederick turn out to have been initiated by his predecessors, none of whom – by any stretch of the imagination – can be deemed 'enlightened'.[137] In addition, Blanning notes that Frederick was extremely conservative, channelling many of the mercantilist policies of the previous century, and

---

[130] Scott, '1763-1786', p. 178.
[131] Horn, *Frederick the Great*, p. 111.
[132] Scott, '1763-1786', p. 186.
[133] Brendan Simms, *Britain's Europe: A thousand years of conflict and cooperation* (London, 2016), pp. 68-69.
[134] Ritter, *Frederick the Great*, p. 175.
[135] Derek McKay and H. M. Scott, *The rise of the great powers 1648-1815* (London and New York, 1983), p. 220; H. M. Scott, *The birth of a great power system, 1740-1815* (London and New York, 2006), p. 151.
[136] Blanning, *Frederick the Great*, p. 367.
[137] Tim Blanning, 'Frederick the Great and enlightened absolutism' in H. M. Scott, ed, *Enlightened absolutism: Reform and reformers in later eighteenth-century Europe* (Houndmills and London, 1990), p. 268.

hypocritical, particularly in his championing of relaxations on censorship which were not often reversed in practice.[138] However, despite all the caveats and problems, Blanning argues that Frederick's Prussia was living in an enlightenment, and that the ruler himself was dyed-in-the-wool by the Enlightenment.[139]

Mitchell may have been critical of Frederick for a number of reasons. He could no longer exert any personal or political influence on Frederick's conduct. Was it because he and Prussia were now largely peripheral to British diplomacy? It is interesting to speculate whether Mitchell's criticisms were so remarkable because they fell almost on deaf ears back home. Britain's policy was largely non-interventionist in terms of the commitment of men to fight on land in Europe,[140] and in the re-establishment of relations between Britain and European powers after the war, diplomacy was Britain's main operating tool. It overlooked Frederick's domestic reforms in the hopeful pursuit of an alliance between Britain, Prussia and Russia. As Hamish Scott notes, 'Britain's growing insularity' in the post-war years, where British ministers turned their backs on continental issues and embraced self-congratulation, 'quickly undermined the admiration of her power created by the triumphant Seven Years War'.[141] The diplomatic efforts were still strongly focused on creating a counterpoise to the power of France.

It was precisely this concern to counter French influence that creeps into Mitchell's reports. Of course Mitchell was in the mindset of fighting France through diplomacy – and I have suggested in the chapter on literature that Mitchell might have utilised his position with Frederick to fight a kind of cultural battle against France. Mitchell had identified for some time that the ability to 'rouse the pride and vanity of the French Ministers' was a strength in diplomacy. He added that, as Frederick had told him in 1760, he could 'not fail of piquing their pride, as he knew, by long experience, that the national vanity of being thought the first and only great power in Europe was the ruling passion of all French Ministers'.[142] Such statements make clear that Mitchell seemed to be of a similar mindset to Frederick at that stage. However, it he had looked closer, Mitchell might have seen what Florian Schui calls 'the long shadow of Colbert', France's finance minister under Louis XIV, whose advocacy of certain economic and mercantile policies were taken by Frederick and transformed in his own way, as unoriginal as it might be.[143] Thus, when Frederick employed Frenchmen to implement things such as the tax scheme known as the *Régie*, Mitchell accepted neither the concept nor its implementation.

As noted at the outset of this section, it is beyond comprehension that Mitchell did not realise the pressing need for revenue.[144] One author has recently argued that the need for revenue, primarily motivated by the ever-present threat of war, could be described as an obsession for most states in the eighteenth

[138] *Ibid.*, pp. 268, 272.
[139] *Ibid.*, pp. 274-288.
[140] Simms, *Britain's Europe*, pp. 53-54.
[141] Scott, *Emergence of the eastern powers*, p. 103.
[142] Mitchell to Holdernesse, 20 April 1760, in Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, p. 156.
[143] Schui, *Rebellious Prussians*, p. 95.
[144] These are thoroughly examined in Florian Schui, 'Taxpayer opposition and fiscal reform in Prussia, c. 1766-1787', *Historical Journal*, 54 (2011), pp. 371-399.

century.[145] Letters extremely critical of Frederick's immediate rebuilding efforts, and those he employed to carry out his new initiatives, reaffirm Mitchell's disdain for Frederick's reconstruction efforts. Mitchell was given permission to leave Prussia to travel to Spa in August 1764, being officially recalled from his post for health reasons, and from there, to return to England. He intimated that he may return, and as the exchange of diplomats took place at the same time (Frederick sent a new envoy to London, while Burnet was made charge d'affaires in Berlin), Mitchell could not help but point out the veiled insult Frederick made England in sending one 'Mr Badouin', an envoy 'invested with no character'.[146] Once in Spa, Mitchell was writing to Burnet on the problematic revenue raising activities of Frederick. First in his sights was a new bank, which, Mitchell believed, 'will prove a Chymera'.[147] While the bank scheme eventually came to fruition, Burnet kept Mitchell informed of its development and other initiatives in Prussia. Knyphausen, Calzabigi (the architect of the lottery which Mitchell so criticised) and others were at Potsdam planning the bank, Burnet reported, which had upset the merchants, in addition to the upset over new tolls on rivers. Worst of all, as Burnet told him, Frederick had sold the snuff which Mitchell had given him as a present. Burnet wrote that 'I leave you to make your own Reflections upon this action which however inconsiderable it may appear to some, yet, I think it shows in the strongest Light, to what Degree of insatiable Avarice is arrived at – it is a fact you may depend upon'.[148] Mitchell spent his time in Britain attending parliament, tending to his health, and seeing friends. By December 1765, Mitchell knew he would be returning to Prussia,[149] and, amply armed with updates from Burnet, could report back immediately on his views on Frederick's schemes. He officially arrived back in Prussia in June 1766.

In his first meeting back with Frederick, so Mitchell reported, Frederick conjectured that the great powers of Europe, particularly Austria and France, would not be in a position to make war again for some ten to twelve years. Mitchell counselled caution, reporting that

> I took the liberty of observing that, however probable and pleasing this prospect of long peace might be, it would still be prudent in the governors of the great powers of Europe to look forward and not to rest matters of the utmost importance on bare probabilities. To this his Prussian majesty made no reply…[150]

Other early meetings upon Mitchell's return centred around his mandate to convince Frederick to join a Northern Alliance with Britain, and to justify Britain's defence of Portugal (and the resulting conflict with

[145] Schui, *Rebellious Prussians*, p. 83.
[146] Mitchell to the earl of Buckinghamshire, 14 August 1764, in Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, pp. 346-347.
[147] Mitchell to Burnet, 2 November 1764, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Kemnay, Bundle 82.
[148] Burnet to Mitchell, 30 April 1765, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Kemnay, Bundle 85.
[149] Mitchell to Burnet, 9 December 1765, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Kemnay, Bundle 82.
[150] 'Conversation of the King with the British Ambassador Mitchell', 17 June 1766, *Pol. Corr.*, Vol. 25, pp. 136-137.

Spain and the Bourbon Family Compact). When at the end of 1766 Mitchell was forced to be more explicit in his demands to know Frederick's opinion on the proposed alliance, Frederick was equally frank. 'You do not use [sic] to be so slow of apprehension', Frederick said, 'I really believed you had understood my meaning in the last audience…', going on to explain to Mitchell his opinion that rather than preventing war, this new alliance may accelerate its likelihood.[151] It was another small yet obvious mark of Frederick's changed perceptions of diplomacy and Mitchell's ability to influence his thoughts, though the arguments outlined at the beginning of this chapter also show the issue to be considerably more complex. Mitchell told Macartney in St Petersburg that he was unsure of the security of the new administration (with Pitt brought back into government) and that the changes made foreign powers wary of allying with Britain. 'One thing, however, I feel, as I suppose you do, that the late frequent changes in England have created a degree of diffidence in foreign powers, which renders all negotiation with them difficult and disagreeable'.[152] It was confirmed more explicitly by Mitchell in a letter to Pitt in December 1766, when after formal negotiations, he asked Frederick to talk as a private man. Mitchell wrote Pitt:

> After the audience was ended, I took the liberty of observing to the King of Prussia, that I remarked with regret, in the course of the conversation, that he had not spoken with me with the same freedom and openness he was wont to do on former occasions, and that I suspected he had only given the specious, not the real reasons for his disinclination to the treaty proposed. He answered, with good humour that my conjecture was not absolutely without some foundation, and that he would own to me, as a private man, that it was not easy for him to forget the ill usage and injustice he had met with from our nation, at the time of making the last peace, and he then enumerated particulars.[153]

In the midst of these meetings, Mitchell continued his criticism of Frederick's domestic policies. Again, his criticisms were conveyed in both private and official correspondence, though he used the cypher for official correspondence. He wrote to Macartney in Russia that he believed Frederick in better health than when he, Mitchell, had left for London in 1764, though he felt Frederick was not satisfied with some failures in his schemes, the unhappiness of which was

> … arising chiefly from the adoption of wild schemes of projectors and adventurers, for the augmentation of his revenues, most of which, upon trial, have been found to be either

[151] 'Conversation of the King with the British Ambassador Mitchell', 1 December 1766, *Pol. Corr.*, Vol. 25, p. 316.
[152] Mitchell to Macartney, c. August 1766, cf. Stanhope and Pringle, eds, *Correspondence of William Pitt*, p. 80n1.
[153] Mitchell to Pitt, 6 December 1766, in Stanhope and Pringle, eds, *Correspondence of William Pitt*, pp. 141-142.

> pernicious or impracticable; and besides the attempts to carry them into execution have already had the fatal effects of souring his temper, of alienating from him the affections of his subject, and of hurting the credit and commerce of his countries.[154]

Further reports in the same vein showed Mitchell's cynicism over the likelihood of success in relation to these schemes. In a later dispatch he recorded the anarchy of disorganisation, where the new tax collectors under the *Régie* had suffered internal dispute, with the head of the program, de Launay, shooting one of his officers.[155] The criticism turned personal, attacking Frederick's avariciousness and lack of compassion for his people.

> The King's economy has increased of late to such a degree as to deserve another name; it extends to the meanest trifles. He is often rough, and out of humour, but, indeed, his dominions are exhausted to such a degree, that the bare description would move the hardest heart.[156]

Mitchell's personal relationship with Frederick was almost non-existent from 1767 until his death in 1771. When he had accepted a return to Berlin in 1766 Mitchell evidently hoped that a change in the political balance between Britain and Prussia would make his job a little easier. He had told Pitt in April 1766 that he had only accepted returning to Berlin in the hope that the ministry was headed by Pitt, whom he knew Frederick favoured.[157] The situation between Britain and Prussia had been irretrievable for some time. The political situation at home nor between the two powers had improved as he had hoped. He wrote to the earl of Findlater and Seafield in 1767 that 'I could not with indifference have been an Eye Witness to what has past since I left the Country, the bare narration of them affects me too sensibly, and I have not yet learnt the art of not feeling'.[158] He continued some criticism of Frederick's schemes, but began to suspect that he was somewhat useless to Frederick in the current state of international politics, particularly with Frederick's move toward Russia and the agreement between those states. This was exacerbated by the increasing difficulty he and Burnet found in conducting diplomacy at Frederick's court.

---

[154] Mitchell to Macartney, 7 October 1766, in Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, pp. 367-368.
[155] See Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, pp. 368-369.
[156] *Ibid.*, p. 370.
[157] Mitchell to Pitt, 11 April 1766, in W. Stanhope and J. H. Pringle, eds, *Correspondence of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham*, Vol. 2 (London, 1838), p. 410.
[158] Mitchell to Findlater and Seafield, 4 June 1767, GD248/572/4/9, Grant Papers, National Records of Scotland.

As Burnet reported shortly after Mitchell's death, Frederick's court was a place where 'every Thing is transacted with the greatest Mystery'.[159] James Harris, Mitchell's successor, found this to be true. In trying to assess Frederick's planned moves regarding the partition of Poland, Harris told Lord Suffolk that they were 'kept so exceedingly secret, that it is impossible even to guess what the next step he will take will be'.[160] On Berlin itself as a place for a diplomat, Harris reported to a friend that there was little respect for English diplomats in Berlin, and that the state of Anglo-Prussian relations made this more difficult. However, he said that his diplomatic status was greater in Prussia than other places such as Denmark, and concluded with remarks which Mitchell himself had expressed.

> I feel the many disagreeable circumstances that attend a foreign life, amongst which the perpetual banishment from my country and friends is the most sensible. I however reflect, that every other state of life has also its bad side; and that even in the bosom of one's family, if the mind is totally unoccupied, one is subject to moments of dissatisfaction and spleen, and all that tribe of ill humour which the indolence and inactivity of a home life are too apt to create.[161]

One year later, sometime during 1773, Harris expressed to the same close friend his sentiments on his time in Berlin. His wording demonstrates that the difficult diplomatic life in Berlin for Mitchell during his final years might not have been of his own causing, nor of Frederick's relationship to him. In Harris's understanding, life in Berlin for a British diplomat is simply one of being left out of political machinations and the latest news. The corollary of this is that Frederick was too concerned with his eastern acquisitions, and his relationship with Russia, to be anything more than civil with Britain and its diplomats. Harris wrote:

> The private life of Berlin will not bear being set upon paper, and the public one is of too delicate a nature to be entrusted to it. My own, since I have been here, taking it either in a private or public capacity, has been absolutely void of events, and I scarce ever recollect to have passed a year in such perfect tranquillity.[162]

[159] Burnet to Halifax, 9 February 1771, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Kemnay, Letterbook, Vol. 7.
[160] James Harris to Lord Suffolk, 13 October 1772, in James Harris (third earl), ed, *Diaries and correspondence of James Harris, first earl of Malmesbury*, Vol. 1 (London, 1844), p. 92.
[161] James Harris to Mr Batt, (undated) 1772, in *Ibid.*, pp. 94-98
[162] Harris to Batt, (undated) 1773, in *Ibid.*, pp. 94-95.

In the same letter, Harris gives his reasons for remaining, despite being rumoured for a post in Copenhagen. It is a reminder of one of the potential reasons why Mitchell remained in Berlin despite the nature and atmosphere of the role in his final years. In declining an offer to go to Copenhagen, Harris wrote that:

> Berlin was at this moment what [his previous correspondent] described it; but from the character of his present Majesty might, from one day to another, become the greatest scene of politics in Europe … Moreover, [Copenhagen] was looked on as an inferior Court and, without some very ostensible motive, I should appear to be going backward in my career.[163]

He added that 'in short, without any positive enjoyment of social life, I have no subject of complaint, and my time passes off very tolerably'.[164] Harris's successor Hugh Elliot, who came to Berlin in 1777, also framed the attitudes and people at the court, as well as the best people to know and to avoid. Elliot formed his earlier social contacts with and among the circle of Prince Henry, brother to Frederick. Harris left him a description of the intellectuals in the Berlin Academy, whom Harris felt were 'little above our village schoolmasters' but whose company, according to Elliot's biographer, Elliot himself found enjoyable.[165] While the military man in Elliot greatly enjoyed the military atmosphere of Prussia and of course Frederick with his military exploits,[166] Harris took a more critical view of Frederick which accords more with Mitchell's views stated immediately after the war up until his death.

vi. The end for Mitchell

In 1769 Mitchell reported home an instance, at a public assembly, where Frederick took him aside and had the longest conversation he had had with him for some time – over a quarter of an hour. As the door was left ajar, the French Minister and all in attendance witnessed the meeting. After reporting the contents of their meeting, it was clear Mitchell could see through the whole scenario: 'Perhaps the whole that has happened may have been a scene calculated to mortify the French Minister at court'.[167] In November, Mitchell told his friend the earl of Findlater and Seafield that 'I am really tired of this way of life and wish to be at Home, if I could be with comfort'.[168] In December that year, Mitchell noted that Frederick ignored

[163] *Ibid.*, p. 96.
[164] *Ibid.*, p. 98.
[165] Countess of Minto, *A Memoir of the Right Honourable Hugh Elliot* (Edinburgh, 1868), p. 108.
[166] *Ibid.*, p. 110.
[167] Mitchell to Rochford, 15 July 1769, NAK SP90/88, ff. 101-104.
[168] Mitchell to the earl of Findlater and Seafield, 11 November 1769, GD248/591/2/292, Grant Papers, National Records of Scotland.

him at a public levée for the first time. It might have been due to Frederick's lack of acknowledgement of the French minister, so publicly made, the week before, and Mitchell's happening to stand beside him on this particular day. However, Mitchell seemed unflustered. '…it gives me no sort of concern', he told Rochford, 'as I am conscious to myself of having punctually obeyed all the King my master's instructions, and behaved with all the circumspection and decency so necessary at this Court'.[169] Their final public meeting occurred at a levée about a month before Mitchell's death. Frederick's sarcasm on this occasion, in relation to the British ministry's conduct, was not lost on Mitchell, but he could make no adequate response.[170]

Mitchell died one year prior to the partition of Poland by Prussia, Austria and Russia. He had noted the rumours surrounding the various ideas held toward Poland, which was particularly vulnerable in the post-Seven Years' War settlement. When the partition occurred, it was merely noted by the British ministry to have been a 'curious transaction'. Harris told his superiors in London that he received news of the partition a month after it was signed, and the most he could report home was a change of commanding officers in Polish Prussia.[171] If, as noted above, Frederick turned away from Britain and toward the growing power of eastern Europe, then his secrecy and those of the signatories, noted by the Lord Suffolk in London, would seem to support this. James Harris believed Austria had been complicit in deceiving France in regard to the partition and its support of Prussia's claim to a share, while Lord Suffolk said he did not believe Frederick's supposed unwillingness to be part of the partition, and his London ministers' claims to ignorance.[172]

Mitchell had been kept apprised of news about friends in Britain by Murdoch and others. Murdoch nearly made the journey to Berlin himself, however, he only made it to Helvoetsluis in Holland.[173] Mitchell's reports home are factual and contain the standard diplomatic news. Much has been said above to elaborate on the personal relationship between Mitchell and Frederick. The lack of expansive cultural engagement by Frederick in Mitchell's later years as an ambassador was probably detrimental to their personal bond, for it was, as the main thread of this thesis has attempted to argue, a strong reason for their excellent cooperation for so much of Mitchell's early tenure. In what follows, this section will outline Mitchell's death, the circumstances of his will and the expressions of sympathy sent to Burnet in Berlin, which give an excellent record of how Mitchell was understood by his peers and friends.

Mitchell continued to attend diplomatic levees up until a month before his death, when he began to grow seriously ill. He reported to Rochford on 29 December 1770 that at that levee, Frederick publicly

---

169 Mitchell to Rochford, 23 December 1769, in Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, p. 389.
170 'Conversation of the King with the English Ambassador Mitchell', 26 December 1770, *Pol. Corr.*, Vol. 30, pp. 337-338.
171 Harris to Lord Suffolk, 1 March 1772, in James Harris (3rd earl), ed, *Diaries and Correspondence of James Harris, first earl of Malmesbury*, Vol. 1 (London, 1844), pp. 79-80.
172 James Harris to Lord Suffolk, 7 April 1772, p. 81; Lord Suffolk to James Harris, 5 June 1772, pp. 81-82, both of these letters in *Ibid.*
173 Later letters contained in BL Add MS 6840.

spoke with him about the conduct of the British ministry. Noting the public manner of Frederick's comments, Mitchell observed that different witnesses would report this differently, which might be interpreted in different ways at various courts.[174] Mitchell died of pleurisy on 28 January 1771. Reports written during January 1771 seem to have been compiled by Burnet and signed by Mitchell, as upon Mitchell's death, Burnet reported that Mitchell had been seriously ill for 'several months past'. In the same letter, Burnet noted to Rochford that

> Though your Lordship was so well acquainted with the Worth and Merit of the Man, that it would be needless, I had almost said impertinent, for me to say anything of the excellent Character of his Heart, and the great Talents with which he was endowed, yet in Justice to his Memory, I must beg leave to observe, that England perhaps never lost a Minister more regretted and Esteemed by the Court where he resided, or more universally lamented by all Ranks of People.[175]

It was natural for Burnet to lament Mitchell's passing – the latter had been his protector and master for some fourteen years or more. Burnet told Arthur Forbes that 'Humanity has indeed lost one of her finest Armaments and I my best friend and generous Protector – Oh if the anguish of the most afflicted heart could ough avail! *Quis desiderio sit pudor aut modus tam cari capitis?*'.[176] Soon after his death a character sketch of Mitchell was published in the London Chronicle, which extolled his various personal and professional attributes, and finished with a quote from the exact same poem from Horace's *Odes* as that which Burnet had used. 'When will honour, and unswerving loyalty, that is sister to justice, and our naked truth, ever discover his equal?', it lamented.[177] Archibald Grant of Monymusk wrote to George Burnet, father of Mitchell's secretary, that Mitchell's 'character in last London Chronicall by a Special Friend of Mine is very just'.[178] Frederick also lost another old friend, the Marquis d'Argens, not long after. Mitchell's death might have been sensibly felt by Frederick, but Burnet's words are all we can gather on this occasion. He reported to Sandwich that, having met with the King, Finckenstein read to him a letter from Frederick, 'wherein that Monarch expressed his Sorrow and Regret for the death of the late Sir Andrew Mitchell … in Terms which

[174] Mitchell to Rochford, 29 December 1770, in Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, p. 391.
[175] Burnet to Sandwich, 29 January 1771, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Kemnay, Letterbook, Volume 7.
[176] Burnet to Forbes, 29 January 1771, BL Add MS 58366, f. 22. The Latin quote is from Horace, *Carminia*, I.24.1, 'what impropriety or limit can there be in our grief for a man so beloved?'.
[177] Bisset, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, pp. 404-405. 'A Lament for Quintilius', from Book 1, Poem 24 of Horace's *Odes*.
[178] Archibald Grant to George Burnet, 11 February 1771, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Bundle 81. I have been unable to ascertain the author of the 'character', the author of which seems to have known Mitchell for some time both personally and professionally. As Grant was living in London at this time, we might suppose it was someone connected with Mitchell through London. It seems only coincidence that Burnet utilised the same poem as Grant's 'special friend' to eulogise Mitchell, and Alexander Burnet cannot have been considered a special friend of Archibald Grant, as Grant also notes the 'special friend' urging him to run for Mitchell's parliament seat, something Alexander Burnet was in no position to do.

do great Honour to the Memory of the Deceased'.[179] Frederick's letter shows clear sentiments for Mitchell's loyalty and service but also touches upon the changing relationship that he has had with the British court over time. It is interesting to read Frederick's words in the context of Mitchell's final years at the court, years in which Frederick turned toward other foreign powers for consolidation and inward for rebuilding of his state.

> I offer my sincere regrets on the death of the good knight Mitchell, English envoy at my court, and the personal sentiments which he has always manifested for my interests, have reconciled all my esteem. I really interested myself in its preservation, but his ill health did not allow me to flatter myself to possess it for a long time. It remains to be seen whether his court will think of replacing him, and that is what time will soon teach us.[180]

From this short note we can only draw a small number of things. First, that Frederick felt, even at this time, that Mitchell was still representing 'my interests' and this is what primarily drove his esteem of Mitchell. Reports of travellers such as Nathaniel Wraxall – who was not received by Frederick in Berlin – that Frederick 'never liked the English, and had borne them a grudge ever since the withdrawal of the subsidies in the year 1762' while possible having a relation to truth, seem unfounded here.[181] Frederick might have been misguided in this in terms of Mitchell's criticism in later years, but it certainly holds true for the period of the Seven Years' War. Secondly, he laments Mitchell dying before him, and this resonates with his conception of himself as a weary man, old before his time. Lastly, there is an allusion to the current state of affairs in terms of Prussia's relationship with Britain, and the state to which it had deteriorated can be seen in Frederick's conjecture as to whether there would be a replacement at all (there is no mention of Burnet).[182] We might also note that this is one of a few letters written on this day by Frederick, including letters to Voltaire and d'Alembert.[183]

A well-remarked story is that Frederick wept at Mitchell's funeral. This deserves a little more attention because whether or not it occurred – which may seem trivial – actually lends insight into the

---

[179] Burnet to Sandwich, 2 February 1771, in *Ibid.*
[180] Frederick to Finckenstein, 29 January 1771, *Pol. Corr.*, Vol. 30, p. 415. The original French: Je donne des regrets bien sincères à la mort du bon chevalier Mitchell, envoyé d'Angleterre à ma cour, et les sentiments personnels qu'il a toujours manifestés pour mes intérêts, lui avaient concilié toute mon estime. Je m'intéressais véritablement à sa conservation, mais son état valétudinaire ne me permettait pas de me flatter de le posséder encore longtemps. Reste à savoir si sa cour pensera à le remplacer, et c'est ce que le temps ne tardera pas de nous apprendre.
[181] Carl Edward Vehse, *Memoirs of the court of Prussia*, trans. Franz C. F. Demmler (London, 1854), pp. 218-219.
[182] Halifax, who replaced Sandwich at Secretary of State for the Northern Department just prior to Mitchell's death, empowered Burnet to conduct Britain's diplomacy at Berlin to wait on Frederick's ministers as soon as possible, and to inform them a replacement will be sent soon, all of which seems to emphatically answer Frederick's suspicion. See Halifax to Burnet, 8 February 1771, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Kemnay, Bundle 76.
[183] See *Oeuvres*, Vol. 23, p. 205 for the Voltaire letter, Vol. 24, p. 582 for d'Alembert.

veracity of Frederick's statement on Mitchell after his death, and indeed their personal relationship, which I have explored in this chapter. Burnet reported to Sandwich on 2 February that Mitchell 'was deposited in a private manner but with all becoming Dignity and Decorum in one of the Vaults of the principal French Church here of the Reformed Religion'.[184] On 9 February, Burnet reported that Frederick was confined to his apartment with a swelling in his legs, and had called for a physician.[185] The following week, verbatim extracts from Burnet's letters appeared in British newspapers announcing Mitchell's death.[186] An account of Mitchell's death is given by Thiébault in the original French edition of his memoirs of the court of Berlin. In it, Thiébault asserts that Mitchell's doctor abandoned him, and in the last few days that he died alone and helpless.[187] Bisset disputes this, saying that fees were paid to three doctors who supposedly attended Mitchell in his final days.[188] A year on from Mitchell's death, Thiébault says that, on the orders of Prince Henry of Prussia, Cesar, a privy councillor in his service, brought together about thirty of Mitchell's Berlin friends, to witness the installation of a bust on his tomb (at the Dorotheenstädische Kirche, since destroyed). After the ceremony an informal dinner was held, according to Thiébault, which was gay, and where each person chose their neighbour at table. 'This way of honouring the memory of such an esteemed and cherished man is, as I think, the most worthy of him, and of the prince who conceived the project'.[189] Neither here, nor in Burnet's original reports, is there any mention of Frederick attending or witnessing any funerals or memorials related to Mitchell. To the best of my knowledge accounts of this nature only begin to appear in the nineteenth century, for what reasons it is unclear.

An article in Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine treats the potential for Frederick weeping quite briefly – 'he is said to have wept – whether sincerely or not – as he saw Mitchell's funeral procession pass' – but argues that if he had wept, it would have been due to the many obligations he had for Mitchell's service.[190] *Lowe's Edinburgh Magazine* reports that Frederick observed the 'lifeless body of his old companion, the honest and brave man who had shared with him so many perils and so many toils, carried to its last resting place'.[191] *The Spectator* passively observes that the 'Prussian Court attended his funeral; and Frederick, who watched the procession from a balcony is said to have been affected to tears'.[192] As noted above, British newspapers were reporting on Mitchell's death using words verbatim from Burnet's letters. This alone is enough to lend some credence to the idea of Frederick weeping, but the original letter or letters confirming as much prove illusive. The original Dictionary of National Biography also notes Frederick

[184] Burnet to Sandwich, 2 February 1771, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Kemnay, Letterbooks, Vol. 7.
[185] Burnet to Halifax, 9 February 1771, in *Ibid.*
[186] *Craftsman or Say's Weekly Journal*, Issue 656, 16 February 1771. Burnet's description of the 'dignity and decorum' of the funeral were reused.
[187] Dieudonné Thiébault, *Mes souvenirs de vingt ans de séjour a Berlin*, Vol. 3 (Paris, 1805), pp. 271-282.
[188] Bisset, ed, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2, p. 397n1. While this doesn't absolve the doctor named by Thiébault, one Dr. Mekel, an eminent anatomist, it does give a lie to his other contention.
[189] Thiébault, *Mes souvenirs*, Vol. 3, pp. 271-282.
[190] 'The Scot abroad: The man of diplomacy', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, Vol. 80 (Edinburgh, 1856), p. 272.
[191] 'The plot of Warkotsch; an incident in the Seven Years' War', *Lowe's Edinburgh Magazine*, New Series, Vol. 1 (Edinburgh, 1847), p. 419.
[192] *The Spectator*, 29 June 1850, pp. 616-617.

crying from a balcony observing Mitchell's funeral.[193] In recent books this idea is perpetuated.[194] However, to my knowledge, there is no original evidence or reference to suggest this in any printed or manuscript sources. The sources quoted by *The General Biographical Dictionary*, namely, the St. James's Chronicle Feb 1771 and Volume 2 of Thiébault's *Original Anecdotes*, make no mention of Frederick at Mitchell's funeral.[195] While interest in Frederick's relationship to Mitchell continues today,[196] this is an incident that can be described as dubious in its veracity. The mention of this story through history has perpetuated the notion that Frederick mourned Mitchell's passing and that, somehow, this represents a tragic separation of two long-time friends who endured much in the world of diplomacy and war. However, while this might be partly true – particularly in the case of Mitchell's early years – the story perpetuates a faithfulness of friends which simply did not exist in Mitchell's later life, particularly after his return to Prussia in 1766.

vii. Conclusion

Mitchell died relatively wealthy. When his will was opened in order to execute Arthur Forbes's inheritance, Mitchell had £20,000 in the bank, with an annuity of £2500. Six hundred pounds went to the heir/executor of the will, also Arthur Forbes. 'In short', Arthur Forbes was told in one letter, 'you have a very handsome accession of fortune by your friend's death'.[197] £3000 was gifted to Burnet for his long years of service.[198] But this chapter has shown that Mitchell's later years were coloured by the poor relations of Britain with Prussia. More accurately, Britain's negotiations for a separate peace with France and Austria, coupled with the removal of Pitt, and, most importantly, the end of the British subsidy to Prussia, all alienated Frederick. It might be argued that, with much of the war having run its course on continental Europe, Frederick might have seen little future for a relationship with a kingdom which had neglected his interests for some time. No amount of personal friendship between he and Mitchell could have saved this alliance.

Historians have noted the eagerness of Frederick to secure his eastern borders by forming an alliance with Russia. The fortuitous arrival of Peter III on the throne was a miraculous event for Frederick and, while he seemed disposed to also ally with Britain, the absence of this left Frederick to form strong ties with Russia. The geopolitics of continental Europe were a particular subject of obsession for Frederick, who achieved the partition of Poland with little interference or interest from Britain. While Frederick's

---

[193] Francis Espinasse, 'Mitchell, Sir Andrew (1708-1771)', *Dictionary of National Biography*, pp. 63-64.
[194] Mori, *Culture of diplomacy*, p. 113.
[195] 'Mitchell (Sir Andrew)', in Alexander Chalmers, ed, *The General Biographical Dictionary: A New Edition*, Vol. 22 (London, 1815), p. 203.
[196] A portrait of Frederick, said to be gifted to Mitchell, recently came up for auction in Ireland. See https://www.adams.ie/79765/CIRCLE-OF-ANNA-DOROTHEA-LISIEWSKI-THERBUSCH-18TH-CENTURY-A-Portrait-of-Frederick-II-Hohenzollern-of-Prussia-Frederick-the-Great-half-length-seated-by-a-desk-with-red-sash-within-a-painted-border?view=lot_detail&auction_no=9052, accessed 25 March 2018.
[197] G. Ross to Arthur Forbes, 11 February 1771, BL Add MS58366, f. 27.
[198] Note in the hand of Sir Andrew Mitchell, 10 December 1770, Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Kemnay, Bundle 82.

efforts to rebuild his state after the war attracted Mitchell's criticism, it was done with an eye toward achieving great power status for Prussia, and this was not the Prussia that Mitchell had conceptualised in his mind.

This chapter has espoused the view that whether or not Mitchell retained Frederick's friendship is both an important question and a rather irrelevant one. It is important in the sense of addressing the assertions of scholars who saw Mitchell's role in Berlin after the war as a lonely and desolate existence.[199] Perhaps it was, in a political sense. In other senses it was not. Mitchell continued to conduct diplomacy, to make observations on Prussia and Frederick, in a manner expected of him and by diplomats in general. I have suggested that Frederick's friendship was not the sole reason for Mitchell's existence in Berlin. In this regard, the question posed above is irrelevant. Perhaps Frederick believed Galitzin's implication of Mitchell in the diplomatic betrayal of Prussia by Britain, or perhaps he did not. It is most accurate to say that Frederick's attitude to Mitchell sensibly changed after 1763, as a result of Britain's diplomatic mistakes and as a result of Frederick's own need to focus on his rebuilding projects and his rule. This perhaps leads to the conclusion that, in the contest between cultural diplomacy and traditional *realpolitik*, the former could not adequately withstand the challenges of the latter.

The idea that Frederick wept at Mitchell's funeral procession has been shown to be an assertion with little substance in published evidence. It has long been noted as an argument that Frederick finally realised Mitchell's value to him at too late a juncture. I have investigated the veracity of this myth with the aim of placing this in the context of Mitchell's personal relationship to Frederick in the later years, as well as Frederick's idea of their shared past. I have shown that this event or myth is groundless. Therefore, there is little mythology surrounding Mitchell's death when it comes to Frederick, despite Prince Henry and others making heartfelt memorials to their friend. Mixed reports of Frederick's ill health add doubt to this story. It seems, in the end, that Mitchell died respected by Frederick, but even more loved and respected by Burnet, and those friends at home and abroad who understood the strange mix of diplomacy and personal friendship which accompanied Mitchell's career in Prussia.

[199] Haden-Guest, 'Mitchell, Andrew'; Doran, *Andrew Mitchell,* p. 374.

Chapter 8

Conclusion

> It is as if Mitchell were the precursor of Carlyle himself, another Scotsman possessing Scottish virtues interpreting a Prussian monarch to his English audience.[200]
>
> *B. W. Young, on historian Thomas Carlyle's praise of Mitchell*

> The truth, we are afraid, is that Sir Andrew … was not a very observing man. He seems to have been a reasonably good courtier, a fair diplomatist, a commonplace man of business, and nothing more. Such a conclusion, too, is warranted by the little we hear and see of him in our public history, though he so long filled the important post of ambassador at the most important court of Europe. … Mitchell himself was not endowed with a comprehensive nor an acute mind. He was plodding and painstaking; a good reporter of what Frederick … said and did … ; but Nature seems to have denied him the qualities that constitute a distinguished man.[201]
>
> The Economist*, 1850, in a review of Bisset's* Memoirs *of Mitchell*

Such are the contrasting analyses of Mitchell's career and its worth to historians. It is true that Mitchell was a close reporter of Frederick's words and actions. True also that he was a painstaking witness to events in Prussia before, during, and after the Seven Years' War, and that he seems to have been an able courtier and diplomat. However, not much else of *The Economist*'s quotation rings true with the evidence placed before the reader in this thesis. The above-quoted review also mentioned that Bisset's *Memoirs* might have benefited from a more judicious selection from the many Mitchell papers at his disposal. This thesis has aimed to rectify this in order to elucidate some of the key points emerging from the papers, which contribute to a better understanding of Andrew Mitchell, and this historical period. In the introductory chapter, I outlined the parameters of this thesis as well as the individual focus of each chapter. In this conclusion, I will return to the questions posed at the outset, in the chapter summaries and in general, to offer answers to the key questions of the thesis, drawing upon the research contained therein.

---

[200] B. W. Young, *The Victorian eighteenth century: An intellectual history* (Oxford, 2007), p. 14.
[201] *The Economist*, Saturday July 6, 1850, Volume 8, No. 358, p. 940.

The priority in the opening chapters was to encapsulate Mitchell's early years in the context of the intellectual and political world of the early eighteenth century. To explain Mitchell's motivations was a priority of this thesis, for only with a sound understanding of his psychological and intellectual makeup can we attempt to explain motivations and actions. There is also a supplementary question addressed in Chapter 2: without formal training schools for British diplomats, what can Andrew Mitchell's formative years and his interests tell us about eighteenth-century preparations for a career in diplomacy? Chapter 2 provided a context for interpreting Mitchell's career, and his conceptions of diplomacy, by orientating the reader toward they key themes of his life. Foremost among them was an interest in, and promotion of, intellectual pursuits, both for personal pleasure but also for the greater benefit of society. Membership of learned societies was crucial for helping Mitchell become establish a profile and a reputation in London following his Grand Tour. The question of how indeed he gained such an early entrée into the powerful circles such as those frequented by Lord Chesterfield and the Duke of Richmond, for example, has been investigated.

Mitchell's Royal Society election certificate outlined many of the facets that his friends and his new associations saw in him:

> Andrew Mitchel of the Temple Esqr, Is desirous to become a member of this Honble Society, and we accordingly recommend him as a Gentleman every way qulified, by his skill in all parts of Philosophical & Polite Learning, and by his constant application to promote those ends for which this Society was establish't.[202]

The argument put forward in Chapter 2 was that Mitchell became central to the associations which he made in this early period, and these therefore helped to establish his reputation as a learned intellectual, focused primarily on the promotion and facilitation of knowledge. It was not just in London that Mitchell became acquainted with the intellectual life. His time at the University of Edinburgh, and in the Rankenian Club alongside such men as David Hume and Colin Maclaurin, showed him to be astute both in his judgements of social engagements, and in the roles he played with them. On his Grand Tour, Mitchell renewed his friendship with Charles de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu, whom he had first met in London in 1729. This was to be important when he later arrived in Prussia, in giving him a social and intellectual standing. Chapter 2 is thus vital in establishing Mitchell as a mean of intellectual and social means.

In London, Mitchell was a part of a social circle that included some of the most culturally and politically influential young men of the period, including the poet James Thomson, and George Lyttelton, a leader of the 'Boy Patriot' political group. Mitchell combined these friendships with those made in his associational circles, such as those formed at the Royal Society of London, the Society of Dilettanti, the

[202] Andrew Mitchell Election Certificate, 27 November 1735, Royal Society, EC/1735/18.

Society of Antiquaries, The Egyptian Society, and the Society for the Encouragement of Learning. The latter involved him with literature, booksellers, and, most importantly, authors. It was a group which were almost arbiters of taste and education for a time, before folding under the pressure of the business world of bookselling. The Dilettanti and Egyptian societies were an outlet for Mitchell's masculine or libertine pursuits, although he did not pursue those as much as other members of those groups. The Royal Society and Society of Antiquaries established his intellectual, scientific credentials. He emerged from this formative period more politically and socially aware of possible career trajectories.

Chapter 3 focused on 'The politics of a Scot in London', detailing how Mitchell was drawn into, and succeeded in, politics in the earlier part of his career. It investigated why Mitchell was able to gain entry into powerful political circles, and what attracted people to him. Specifically, it sought to establish Mitchell's relationship to the Duke of Newcastle, who was to play such a vital role in Mitchell's career from 1741 to 1756, when Newcastle lost political control. Indeed, in the Introduction I asked: Did political affiliations affect his social advancement? What were Mitchell's approximate political affiliations? Mitchell's success in London is even more impressive given the growing resentment at Scottish migration to London. Mitchell moved into something of an established milieu in terms of Scots in London: Andrew Millar, James Thomson, Patrick Murdoch, and George Lewis Scott were all in Mitchell's Scottish milieu, which expanded to include like-minded Englishmen and which helped them all, in some way or another, to advance themselves in England. The growing social links between England and Scotland, and especially Edinburgh and London, meant that Scots had a greater role to play in the emergence and importance of their homeland in the British parliament. This did not make it easier for Mitchell to navigate the strong patronage elements such as those controlled by Newcastle and Argyll, but having Newcastle as a supporter certainly was of great support to Mitchell.

Chapter 3's clearest contribution was in disentangling Mitchell's political allegiances, and more clearly establishing the presence or influence of the Squadrone vis-à-vis older elements of Whig and Tory. Part III of Chapter 3 is specifically aimed at exploring Mitchell's various political positions in the context of their factional allegiances and histories. These factors would not have escaped Mitchell when choosing with whom he wished to associate, and to whom he should tie his political future. Mitchell's father had been a supporter of the 'Squadrone' faction in Scotland, a faction opposed to the control of the Dukes of Argyll in Scotland and who for brief periods held control over Scottish affairs. By the time Mitchell came to political maturity in the 1740s, the Squadrone faction was a more nominal interest led by the Marquis of Tweeddale, Mitchell's direct superior in the office of Secretary of State for Scotland. The 'Argathelian' faction of the 2nd duke of Argyll, and his more dominant brother, the earl of Ilay, were almost irresistible in terms of political patronage. Chapter 3 explores the ways in which Mitchell navigated this as a Squadrone supporter, and then as a recipient of the patronage of Newcastle. Chapter 3 disentangles some of these allegiances in the wake of Robert Walpole's downfall in 1742, with a focus on exploring the political realities for Mitchell.

It is not surprising that Mitchell's social memberships declined in this period when his government workload increased, most notably in 1745 with the Jacobite Rebellion. Mitchell's efforts in this period were recognised and explored in Chapter 3 with a view to adding valuable biographical and contextual information on his work in the period which is otherwise missing from current scholarship. This early period investigation culminated in discussion of Mitchell's missions to Brussels as a trade commissioner from 1752 to 1754, tasked with renegotiating the Treaty of the Barrier of 1715, which held together Britain, the Dutch Republic, and Austria in a mutual defence against France. Mitchell's failures there were not due to his work: although he formed a good knowledge of the Austrian State Chancellor Wenzel Anton von Kaunitz, he was unable to influence proceedings, which were perhaps made clearer in 1756 with the Diplomatic Revolution. There, Kaunitz's longer term goals, supported by the Austrian Empress Maria Theresa, were put into place. It is there that Chapter 4 commenced. In sum, Chapter 3 was keen to also answer this question: How does Andrew Mitchell's early career further inform interpretations of 'new diplomatic history'? The answer I suggested is that Mitchell continued to blend his political life with his cultural and intellectual interests. By this point it was clear that the two were permanently intertwined in Mitchell's conception of a statesman.

Chapter 4 was entitled 'Mitchell and the growth of an intellectual network between Berlin and Britain'. Joining the previous two chapters with the themes to be explored in the remaining part of the thesis, the thematic question was defining what made Andrew Mitchell the best fit for Britain's relationship with Frederick II and Prussia in the middle of the eighteenth century, given Britain's relative lack of interest in Prussia as an ally which was reflected in its poor choice of diplomatic representatives in the first half of the century? Specifically, it asked: Why did Mitchell succeed where others, such as Charles Hanbury Williams, had failed? What was it about Mitchell's conduct that placed him so close, personally and professionally, to Frederick? One of the suggestions I put forward in this section is that Mitchell's early shows of loyalty earned him strong political credit. The other is that knowledge and intellectual pursuits were key to forging a strong relationship. Mitchell was keen to demonstrate his personal loyalty to Frederick, in conjunction with a sharing of intellectual and literary interests from an early stage. The differences were clear. Recall Williams' statement about the state of his diplomatic mission in Prussia before Mitchell's arrival:

> Nothing can make a worse figure than I do at this court. Most people have orders not to visit me; the common civilities that are paid to other Ministers are not paid to me. [Williams was] look'd upon as a dangerous spy and an enemy to his Prussian Majesty's views, and treated accordingly.[203]

[203] See above, p. 97n27.

Contrast this with Mitchell's willingness to assist in Frederick's diplomatic priorities, as he began to see them as strongly connected to the best interests of Britain. For example, when Mitchell wrote ill-advisedly to his superiors about Prussia's potential new ally, the Prince of Hesse-Cassel, he acceded willingly to Frederick's arrangements to keep the Prussian-British alliance on track. Frederick said 'I will deny that I ever said such things & lay it upon you, I will tell Him that you are an Enthusiast and so zealous a protestant that you can not think with candour of one that has changed his Religion'. and Mitchell added 'to this I agreed'.[204] Furthermore, if Frederick's doctor Zimmermann is to be believed, Mitchell also made demonstrative signs of support for Frederick, particularly in the instance of visibly rebuking Lord Stormont on his conduct in confronting Frederick over his treatment of Saxony.[205] Williams privileged a personal style of intellectual libertinism, which contrasts visibly with Mitchell's decidedly more circumspect actions of cultivating relationships, liaising, and facilitating with Prussian intellectuals whose interests were directly related to his diplomacy and his network. While Mitchell might not have had the 'graces' of which Lord Chesterfield had written to his son (and which Frederick noted to Catt), Mitchell possessed both the mental and physical fortitude[206] which made his mission a success where Williams had failed.

In defining the impact of the Diplomatic Revolution on Britain's alliances, Chapter 4 began by contextualising the challenge facing Mitchell. Although Frederick was now favourably disposed to Britain and the tenuous alliance system that unfolded, Mitchell still had to win his trust and his confidence. He had to show Frederick that he was acting in his interests as well as those of Britain. If so many British diplomatic missions were relatively ineffective or unresponsive to change – and Jeremy Black's *British diplomats and diplomacy* is consistent on this point – then how do we explain the long, mostly productive tenure of Andrew Mitchell in Berlin? Much of the tone of Mitchell's tenure was set in these early months and years. He showed an interest in the literary and scientific circles of Berlin, and was able to converse freely with Frederick in French about all manner of topics that the king was interested in. Chapter 4 argued that they thus formed a strong personal bond through culture, which was inseparable from Mitchell's conception of his diplomacy. He strengthened the bonds of culture and diplomacy by engaging with key members of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, and by promoting the sharing of knowledge between Britain and Prussia through his status as a man of social means. He was known for his role in the Royal Society, and his friendships with such men as Hume, Thomson, and Montesquieu. Moreover, the presence of Mitchell's friend Patrick Murdoch, as his temporary secretary in Berlin, certainly gave the mission its intellectual air. Murdoch was a known member of London intellectual circles and had produced work on mathematics and astronomy which was gaining a European reputation. It certainly helped to give an air of culture and intellect

[204] See above, p. 99n41.
[205] See above p. 99-101.
[206] For the mental fortitude, see Frederick's praise of Mitchell's bravery in speaking plainly to him in view of all his generals at table, p. 113; For his physical fortitude, see Rouet's praise of Mitchell as Frederick's loyal and faithful 'Achates', the famed companion, and *alter ego*, of Aeneas in Virgil's *Aeneid*, on p. 122.

to Mitchell's mission, and while Mitchell was on the battlefield, Murdoch assisted in maintaining and growing some of those early friendships Mitchell forged. They were to be a valuable link for Mitchell when Murdoch returned to London in 1757, where he could be a connection in Mitchell's intellectual network between Britain and Berlin.

Chapter 4 concluded with a brief prosopographical survey of intellectuals in Mitchell's orbit to give a sense of the world in which he corresponded and moved. Nowhere else is Mitchell's close early relationship to men such as Leonhard Euler documented in this context, and this is a valuable original contribution to knowledge about British and Prussian intellectual links in this period. Furthermore, Euler was a key member of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, and this is explored in more depth in Part IV of Chapter 4. As the Academy was a key instrument of Frederick's enlightened absolutism, it was clear to Mitchell that involvement in this Academy and knowledge of its members was key to his mission. He forged friendships with Euler, J. H. S. Formey, the Academy's perpetual secretary, and others. Thus, Chapter 4's key contribution was to establish Mitchell's dual interests: literature and science, and to inform the reader how they became so key to Mitchell's mission and its success, given the historical paucity of British diplomatic success in Prussia.

Mitchell made some crucial, and currently unrecognised, contributions to the growth of science in the middle of the century. Chapter 5 provided an original and sustained analysis of this contribution and its implications for science. It argued that Mitchell arrived in Berlin with a reputation as a man of science and learning, and only enhanced this reputation throughout his tenure. The prime motivator, and the lens through which Chapter 5 argues its points, is that Mitchell conformed to the definition of 'intermediary' in the Republic of Letters, as defined by Anne Goldgar and which is explored at the chapter's outset. In Chapter 1 I asked what did it mean to be an 'intermediary', and why does Andrew Mitchell fit this categorisation so well? The 'intermediary' was a facilitator, associated often in a broad or loose sense with the Republic of Letters and its circles of knowledge. Mitchell acted as an 'intermediary' in many different ways and capacities.

The conduct of Mitchell's friendships was more acute in the context of politically-charged situations. Facilitation, in line with his role as an 'intermediary', was a key part of Mitchell's conduct during his mission.[207] The first of these was Mitchell's efforts to obtain for his friend in Prussia, Johann Georg Sulzer, a telescope by John Dollond. The facilitation of obtaining this instrument, one of the rarest and most sought-after of its time, was seen by Sulzer as a symbol of Mitchell's devotion to the growth of science and astronomy. In Sulzer's eyes, it raised Mitchell to a higher status than that of the lofty one in Prussia which he already held. As Sulzer wrote to Mitchell at this time, there was no need to explain the miraculous benefits of the Dollond telescope for science, because Mitchell was already aware of them.[208] The chapter shed more light on Prussian considerations of Dollond's achievement, in particular the long-held interest

[207] For example, see above, p. 127.
[208] See Part III of Chapter 5.

of Mitchell's acquaintance, Leonhard Euler, in this area. In light of Mitchell's success, and in recognition of the scientific esteem in which he was held by Sulzer and other Prussians, Sulzer proposed to sell the rare anatomical materials of Johann Nathanael Lieberkühn to the Royal Society of London, with Mitchell as the facilitator of the sale. In doing so, Sulzer noted Mitchell's unique position as the 'intermediary' in Prussian and British scientific links.

Chapter 5 argued that variations on the conceptions of science and its uses existed in Britain and Prussia. Britain, it was argued, saw itself both as a leader in the creation and arbitration of new scientific knowledge, but that it also saw, through its role as a colonial and global power, that its role was to help facilitate a more general growth in scientific knowledge in the age of Enlightenment and exploration. Mitchell subscribed to no prevailing ideologies or membership of any 'imagined community', and as I argued in Chapter 5, we should 'see his place, and the places of those he recognised and assisted, as contingent'.[209] For Prussia, much of its scientific activities were directed toward improvement of the state but also the conduct of war. As I argued when interpreting Mitchell's visits to Prussian mines, '… in some way the visit can be seen as a visible reminder to Frederick that Mitchell understood and appreciated his aims, particularly in a time of war (1760) when improvements in iron, for example, were vital to Prussian weaponry such as cannon'.[210] Chapter 5 argued that Frederick conceptualised his Academy of Sciences as vehicles of improvement, and that Mitchell, between Britain and Prussia, was able to create links between the two places and their scientists despite these differences. Mitchell's ability to facilitate and render services bolstered his reputation in the scholarly world, and therefore gave him advanced standing in the minds of Frederick and his intellectuals – examples include the Dollond and Lieberkühn cases.[211]

As I argued in Chapter 6, if we follow Blanning in seeing Frederick's vision as combining power with culture, then the corollary is that Mitchell probably recognised the diplomatic benefits of taking it upon himself to introduce German scholars to Frederick. To influence Frederick to look inward for cultural and intellectual prosperity and energy, rather than to French culture and authors of bygone ages, was at the top of Mitchell's cultural-diplomatic priorities. By this point in the thesis, the reader may well see that Mitchell was indeed the 'sagacious' man that Carlyle saw him to be. However, he was also not an overly demonstrative one.

Chapter 6 established Mitchell as a prime leader of British literary interest in Prussia. The question driving this chapter, and one posed in Chapter 1, was: What is the importance of Mitchell's encouragement of German authors? It certainly discouraged any growth of French literature in Germany and Prussia, and built on a more general sense among the leading German literati that German literature was on the rise and could of course benefit from a champion like Andrew Mitchell.[212] The chapter first added valuable context

[209] See above p. 130.
[210] See above p. 155.
[211] For Dollond, see above, pp. 135-138; For Lieberkühn, pp. 138-140.
[212] See for example pp. 184-185.

to the way German literary figures and authors might have thought of Mitchell. It was argued that he was a man uniquely placed to assist and encourage the German writers in the growth of their literary world. Mitchell had arrived in Prussia with literary caché, as Thiebault noted, Mitchell was 'united by the strictest bonds of friendship with the author of *L'Esprit des lois*'.[213] Not only was he a friend to Hume, Thomson, and other luminaries now being extolled in Germany, but he was also something of an arbiter of taste given his experience in British literary circles. As I argued there, this explains why the friends of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, perhaps the greatest figure of the mid-century German enlightenment, put him forward as a possible secretary to Andrew Mitchell. Chapter 1 posed the question thus: How important was Mitchell's literary background to his success in Prussia? What did he do to grow his reputation in this field, and to use it for cultural diplomacy? As noted above, I argued that Andrew Mitchell was in a reasonably defined position as a respected authority on British literature and philosophy in Prussia and broader Germany.[214] Indeed Mitchell's Britain had a high reputation in Germany as the land of philosophers and poets, and of literary sophistication – Mitchell could then become the 'man on the spot' who knew Hume, who knew Johnson, who knew Pope, which gave him cultural credit in a shifting German literary environment.[215] There are further questions posed in Chapter 1, and addressed in Chapter 6, that are highly relevant here. How familiar was Mitchell with Hume on a personal level? Did Mitchell use Hume for cultural credit in Prussia? What view did Frederick take of Mitchell's literary facilitation?

As to the first, regarding Mitchell and Hume, my research has shown that they were quite close, and definitely on familiar terms at Edinburgh University. Moreover, although it came later in their careers and lives, Hume saw Mitchell again, and held strong views on Mitchell's character and his career. This could only have come from one who knew him reasonably well and was 'familiar'.[216] On the second question of whether familiarity with Hume gave Mitchell cultural credit in Prussia, it certainly endeared him to Sulzer, who had translated Hume, and who was to become one of Mitchell's closest scientific and literary friends in Prussia. It also assisted his work with Frederick – ever the philosophe – through their mutual friend the Earl Marischal.

On the third question of Frederick's views on Mitchell's literary facilitation, this chapter provides new research. Joining forces with Frederick's close friend the Marquis d'Argens, Mitchell's arrangement of meetings of Frederick with Leipzig intellectuals is here argued to have been a valuable effort by Mitchell to open Frederick's eyes to the strengths of his people. Not only were they writing in praise of Frederick, they were also taking his ignorance of their efforts to be a spur to greater achievements. The primary focus of Mitchell's promotion of German literature to Frederick is Mitchell's introduction of Christian Fürchegott Gellert to the king. Gellert, also one very interested in English literature and by that point the well-known author of a collection of fables, has left us the strongest evidence for Mitchell's efforts and the way he was

[213] See above p. 134.
[214] See above, p. 160.
[215] For more, see p. 164 passim.
[216] See for example quotes on pp. 168, 174.

seen by native German authors and intellectuals. Mitchell himself, as usual, is silent on this topic and does not indulge in self-praise. In fact, he recorded no trace of his efforts in Leipzig over the winter of 1760-1761. Thus, the further original contribution here is to take what German language evidence is available to historians and to piece together the evidence of this valuable contribution to British and German cultural links. Most crucially, the episode of Gellert's meeting is argued to be crucial to understanding Mitchell's brand of cultural diplomacy. The episodes this chapter examined were cultural exchanges as much as literary exchanges;[217] intellectual debates as well as philosophical ones. The intellectual titan Lessing nearly became Mitchell's secretary.[218] As a Saxon, Gellert probably held strong views on Frederick's treatment of Saxony, but Mitchell could nevertheless still skilfully arrange a meeting between the pair, for which Gellert and others praised him.[219] This chapter argues that the pinnacle of Mitchell and Frederick's literary relationship, and a key moment in defining Mitchell's cultural diplomacy, comes when Frederick asked Mitchell to engage in a thorough critique of his philosophical writings, as a result of which they sat '5 or 6 days at table', alone together.[220] After this point, there is never a repeat of this cultural bonding moment.

Chapter 7 established 'the limits of diplomacy', or, in other words, to what extent Mitchell's cultural diplomacy could legitimately be argued to have had an influence on Frederick, his policies, and the conduct of British diplomacy at his court. How far could cultural diplomacy take Mitchell? In the context of investigating the crumbling of the cultural edifice, I ask, most importantly, what role did Mitchell play in the events of the first half of 1762, which effectively realigned the balance of European diplomacy once more? It became clear in Chapter 7 that there were significant limits on cultural diplomacy, many of which originated in circumstances outside Mitchell's control. As quoted in this chapter, Mitchell's scepticism about Frederick's political abilities came to the fore when Frederick was put under diplomatic pressure, and quickly overcame the cultural bonds between them: 'I am inclined to think that this peace exists only in the King of Prussia's imagination, which is indeed fruitfull and lively, and affords him much comfort by overlooking or at least diminishing every obstacle and difficulty which might oppose or retard the accomplishment of his wishes'.[221] In other words, cultural diplomacy as exercised by Mitchell worked to the extent that he was in favour and Frederick was susceptible to this form of influence. Once the British ministry appeared to be trying to deceive Frederick by forming alliances elsewhere, the tools of cultural diplomacy could be of little use in the face of changing great power interests. The cultural diplomacy so carefully built up by Mitchell between 1756 and 1761 crumbled in the cold light of Britain's disintegrating relationship with Frederick and Prussia.[222]

Chapter 7 began with an overview of British foreign policy in the 1760s. It then took a very close view of the factors that clove the British-Prussian relationship in two. Integral to this was the

[217] See Frederick's interview with Gellert on pp. 191-192.
[218] See p. 181.
[219] See pp. 192-194.
[220] See p. 185.
[221] See p. 208.
[222] See p. 198 onward.

disorganisation of the British ministry, and the tussle for control of foreign policy between Bute and Newcastle. The two leading themes of Chapter 7 were the political relationship of Britain and Prussia, and the relationship of its two representatives in this thesis, Mitchell and Frederick. Considerations of Mitchell's relationship to Frederick cannot be made without the contextual basis of the political discussion. Frederick felt betrayed by Britain's negotiations, or rumoured negotiations, with other powers. The key question in Chapter 7 came when I investigated Galitzin's implication of Mitchell in the betrayal of Frederick. Did Frederick believe that Mitchell assisted Bute in deceiving him, and leaving Prussia stranded? I argue that he did not, and that he focused his criticisms and bitterness on Bute and George III, rather than toward Mitchell, who was relatively powerless.

When the devastation of the effects of the war were seen in Prussia, and stock was taken of the requirements for rebuilding Prussia, it was no longer possible for Mitchell to influence Frederick, who was himself more interested in revitalising revenues and rebuilding infrastructure. Combined with Britain's poor treatment of their ally over 1761 and 1762, Mitchell was robbed of his two key influences over Frederick's diplomatic relationship to Britain and other powers. Thus, what has been seen as a personal detachment of Frederick from Mitchell by authors such as Doran is here reinterpreted as a result of external factors rather than personal antipathy. I argue that it was no judgement of Mitchell's skills if Frederick chose to focus his attentions elsewhere. While Mitchell was critical of many of Frederick's initiatives – explored here in terms of Mitchell's thoughts for the first time – and indeed, recorded his opinions of Frederick's avarice, this was in effect a result of the post-war situation rather than out of personal animosity.

Mitchell's career is representative of a number of themes in the study of eighteenth-century British culture. These include, but are not limited to, masculine association, learned societies, sociability, and the growth of science and literature. It highlights the hitherto largely ignored roles that Andrew Mitchell played in the growth and promotion of science, literature, knowledge, and the intellectual world of Britain between 1735 and 1756. Thereafter, his cultural role and interests changed, being channelled through diplomacy and conducted largely from Berlin. It was argued that his particular interest in cultural diplomacy, combined with his skills as a diplomat, strengthened and maintained his own, and Britain's, relationship with Frederick beyond what might have occurred had he never gone to Prussia. The ultimate conclusion must be, with all the evidence of Chapter 7, that despite the cultural pursuits and successes in Prussia outlined in Chapters and 6, political exigencies came to outweigh what might be achieved with cultural tools in the world of diplomacy. When the political connections between Britain and Prussia were extremely tenuous and getting worse in mid-1762, Mitchell wrote to Keith expressing his view that the personal bond between he and Fred was there but was robbed of its power by the political situation. This solidifies the view that their cultural and intellectual bonding elements were not strong enough to overcome politics: 'I have, in some measure, regained the confidence of the hero, with whom I live; and he hears from me what, perhaps, he would not have patience to do from another. This is, in truth, the reason why I remain here'.[223]

[223] See above, p. 212.

Nevertheless, having examined what the possibilities are for explorations of the influence of culture on diplomacy, and indeed, as Mori termed it, 'the culture of diplomacy', this thesis points the way for further work in this field which might establish a stronger basis for reconsidering how we interpret eighteenth-century diplomacy.

Appendix 1:

Mitchell's Royal Society nominations

Table 1 – Men nominated to fellowship of the Royal Society of London by Andrew Mitchell

Name (born-died)	Originated	Occupation/Business	Nominated
George Lewis Scott (1708-1780)	Scotland	Preceptor to the Prince of Wales	10 February 1735/36[1]
Sir Hugh Smithson (Later Hugh Percy, 1st Duke of Northumberland) (1715-1786)	England	Peer, Politician	18 March 1735/36[2]
Francesco Algarotti (1712-1764)	Venice	Writer, courtier, and amateur scientist	8 April 1736[3]
Dr. Herman Bernard (d. 1766)	Prussia	Medical doctor	12 January 1737[4]
Dr. Andrew Cantwell (d. 1764)	Ireland	Medical doctor and physician residing in Paris	2 March 1737[5]
Philip Naudé (1684-1745)	Prussia	Professor of Mathematics at Royal College of Joachimsthal	24 November 1737[6]
Antonio Francesco Gori (1691-1757)	Florence	Antiquarian and priest	4 May 1738[7]

[1] RS JBO 17, f. 38.
[2] RS EC/1736/04.
[3] RS EC/1736/07.
[4] RS EC/1738/01; RS JBO 17, f. 171.
[5] RS EC 1738/06; RS JBO 17, f. 203. For more on Cantwell, see Elizabeth A. Williams, *A cultural history of medical vitalism in Enlightenment Montpellier* (Aldershot and Burlington, 2003).
[6] RS EC/1737/17. Naudé had given 'singular proofs of uncommon capacity in the Science which he professes [mathematics]. This was not lost on Leonhard Euler, later a friend of Mitchell, who worked with Naudé on mathematical problems in 1740. See C. Edward Sandifer, *How Euler did it* (Mathematical Association of America, 2007), pp. 85-90. It also possible that Naudé's election was supported by Abraham de Moivre, among others, in return for Naudé's support for his election to the early Berlin Academy of Sciences, the Berlin-Brandenburgische Sozietät der Wissenschaften. See David R. Bellhouse, *Abraham de Moivre: Setting the stage for classical probability and its applications* (Boca Raton, 2011), pp. 209-210.
[7] RS EC/1738/03.

Monseigneur François Xavier de Bon, Marquis de St Hillaire (1678-1761)	France	President of the Royal Society of Sciences at Montpellier	16 November 1738[8]
George Louis Leclerc, Comte de Buffon (1707-1788)	France	Intendant of the French Royal Gardens, Fellow of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Paris	8 November 1739[9]
Eustachio Zanotti (1709-1782)	Bologna	Professor of Astronomy at Bologna	27 March 1740[10]
Monseigneur Giulio Sachetti (unknown)	Rome	Formerly cameriere d'onore to late Pope Clement XII, and Canon of St Peters	27 March 1740[11]
Monseigneur Michel Agnola Giacomelli (1695-1774)	Pistoia	Formerly private chaplain to late Pope Clement XII	27 March 1740[12]
Captain Frederick Lewis Norden (1708-1742)	Denmark	Sailor and explorer	5 June 1740[13]
Jerome de Salis, 2nd count of Salis-Soglio (1709-1794)	Holy Roman Empire	Diplomatic consul at the Grisons	18 December 1740[14]
Francis Philip Duval (d. 1768)	Dutch Republic	Doctor of Medicine, later physician to the	22 January 1740/1[15]

[8] RS EC/1738/14; RS JBO 17, ff. 309-310.
[9] RS EC/1739/15.
[10] RS EC/1740/10; RS JBO 18, f. 73.
[11] RS EC/1740/11; RS JBO 18, f. 74.
[12] The election certificate spells his Christian name as Michelangelo. RS EC/1740/09; RS JBO 18, ff. 74-75.
[13] RS EC/1740/21. Normally spelled 'Louis', later author of *Voyage d'Egypte et de Nubie* (Copenhagen, 1755) the English translation coming two years after the original in 1757.
[14] RS EC/1740/28.
[15] Brief biographical note on Duval available at Royal College of Physicians, 'Lives of the fellows', at http://munksroll.rcplondon.ac.uk/Biography/Details/1373, accessed 10 July 2017.

		Dowager Princess of Wales	
Ralph Knight (unknown)	Britain	Unknown	26 February 1740/1[16]
William Battie (1704-1776)	England	Physician and classicist	14 May 1741[17]
Dr. Richard Pococke (1704-1765)	England	Travel writer and Church of Ireland Bishop	12 November 1741[18]
Jeremiah Milles (c. 1714-1784)	England	Antiquary and dean of Exeter	14 January 1741/2[19]
Jean Marie Francois du Parc, Marquis of Locmaria (c. 1708-1745)	France	Man of letters	16 June 1743[20]
Baron Friedrich August von Hardenberg (1700-1768)	Hanover	Privy Councillor to King in Hanover	7 March 1744/5[21]
Sir John Pringle (1707-1782)	Scotland	Physician	25 April 1745[22]
Louis de Beaufort (1703-1795)	France	Historian	20 March 1745/6[23]
Don Louis de Ulloa (1716-1795)	Spain	Naval general, explorer and scientist	15 May 1746[24]
Antonio Nicolini, Marchese di Ponsacco (1700-1769)	Florence	Abbot and jurist	8 January 1746/7[25]

[16] RS EC/1741/05.
[17] RS EC/1741/12.
[18] RS EC/1741/15.
[19] RS EC/1742/05.
[20] RS EC/1743/11. Mary Terrall relates the commissioning of an engraving of Maupertuis by Locmaria, which was supplemented by verses from Voltaire. See Mary Terrall, *The man who flattened the Earth: Maupertuis and the sciences in the Enlightenment* (Chicago and London, 2002), p. 161 and n.
[21] RS EC/1745/07.
[22] RS EC/1745/13; JBO 19, f. 397.
[23] RS EC/1746/07.
[24] RS EC/1746/13. Alloa discovered platinum and wrote the first treatise on it, which in time would be treated by a recipient of Andrew Mitchell's patronage, William Lewis. See F. W. Gibbs, 'William Lewis, M. B., F. R. S. (1708-1771)', *Annals of Science*, 8 (1952), pp. 122-151.
[25] RS EC/1747/01. Nicolini was in England at the time of his nomination, making him personally known to Mitchell.

Marchese Falco Rinuccini (unknown)	Florence	Nobleman	8 January 1746/7[26]
Ernst Christoph Manteuffel (1676-1749)	Saxony	Ambassador, writer and literary patron	7 January 1747/8[27]
John Blair (d. 1782)	Scotland?	Church of England clergyman and author	29 May 1754[28]
John Gregory (1724-1773)	Scotland	Professor of Medicine at Aberdeen	8 April 1756[29]
William Graeme (unknown)	Scotland	Commander in Chief of Venetian Land Forces	5 December 1765[30]
Sir William Hamilton (1730-1803)	England	British Ambassador to Naples	20 March 1766[31]

[26] RS EC/1747/02. Rinuccini was in England at the time of his nomination, making him personally known to Mitchell.
[27] RS EC/1748/01.
[28] RS EC/1754/16; Blair's early life is mysterious but his relations came from Perthshire, Scotland and he attended Edinburgh University, pointing towards Scotland as his birthplace. See Richard B. Sher, 'Blair, John (d. 1782)', *ODNB*, at www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2567.
[29] RS EC/1756/10.
[30] RS EC/1765/32. Ranald MacInnes relates how the architect Robert Adams' brother James was secreted to Venice by Graeme in the guide of a Jacobite officer under Graeme's protection. See Ranald MacInnes, 'Robert Adam: My mother's dear British boy", in Allan I. McInnes, Kieran German, and Lesley Graham, eds, *Living with Jacobitism, 1690-1788: The three kingdoms and beyond* (London and New York, 2016), p. 176. Graeme had been the Commander of Venice's Land Forces since 1756. See Andrea di Robilant, *A Venetian affair: A true tale of forbidden love in the 18th century* (New York, 2005), p. 59n.
[31] RS EC/1766/14.

Appendix 2:

List of Andrew Mitchell's known book subscriptions

Date	Author	Work	Publisher	Preface?	Subscription type and cost	Mitchell listing	Comments
1730	James Thomson	The Seasons	Not given	Not given	Not given	no pp.	Listed in three editions in this year
1741	Nicholas Saunderson	The Elements of Algebra in Ten Books, Vol. 1	Not given	John Saunderson	Standard (not royal)	no pp.	
1741	John Martyn (editor)	Pub. Virgilii Maronis Georgicorum Libri Quatuor. The Georgicks of Virgil, with an English Translation and Notes.	Richard Reily	John Martyn	Not given	no pp.	
1743	Henry Fielding	Miscellanies, in three volumes (Vol. 1)	Andrew Millar	Author	Royal Set (special) x 2	no pp.	
1743	Thomas Birch	The Heads of Illustrious Persons of Great Britain, Engraven by Mr. Houbraken, and Mr. Vertue with their Lives and Characters.	John and Paul Knapton	Not given	Not given	no pp.	

1744	Robert Boyle	The works of the honourable Robert Boyle. In Five Volumes. To which is prefixed a life of the author. Volume 1.	Andrew Millar	Thomas Birch	Large Paper	p. vii	
1744	Various	A Select Collection of Old Plays. Volume the First.	R. Dodsley	R. Dodsley	Standard	no pp.	
1747	Rev. Mr. Spence	Polymetis: or, An Enquiry concerning the Agreement Between the Works of the Roman Poets, and the Remains of the Antient Artists. Being an Attempt to illustrate them mutually from one another.	R. Dodsley	Not given	Not given	p. x	
1748	George Anson	A Voyage around the World, In the Years MDCCXL, I, II, III, IV. Compiled by Richard Walter.	John and Paul Knapton		Not given	no pp.	
1748	Colin Maclaurin	An Account of Sir Isaac Newton's philosophical discoveries, in four books	Various	Patrick Murdoch	5 books	no pp.	
1748	T. Rutherforth	A System of Natural Philosophy Being a Course of Lectures in Mechanics, Optics,	Joseph Bentham	Author	Not given		

		Hydrostatics, and Astronomy; Which are read in St Johns College, Cambridge, Vol.1 of 2					
1749-1752	James Foster	Discourses on all the Principal Branches of Natural Religion and Social Virtue, Vol. 2	Various	not given	Not given	no pp.	
1750	Archibald Bower	The History of the Popes from the Foundation of the See of Rome to the Present Time (Vol. 2).	Not given		Not given	p. xvi	
1750	Colin Maclaurin	An Account of Sir Isaac Newton's philosophical discoveries, in four books	Andrew Millar	Patrick Murdoch	Not given		
1752	John Lodge Cowley	Geometry made Easy: or, A new and methodical Explanation of the Elements of Geometry.	M. Mechell	Author	7 shillings and sixpence	p. 3	Given as honourable MP for Aberdeen
1756	Not given	A List of the Society of Antiquaries	Not given	Not given	N/A		
1756	Not given	A Summary View of the Rise, Constitution, and Present State of the Charitable Foundation of King Charles the Second	William Strahan	Not named	£5 5 shillings benefaction	p. 26	Benefactor of Scots Corporation. Paid £5 5 shillings. Also

		Commonly Called, *The Scots Corporation in London*, with an Alphabetical List of the Benefactors taken from the Registers, and from the Tables hung up in their Hall.					listed in 1777, 1761, 1766 versions
1757	Demosthenes	Orations of Demosthenes, translated by Rev. Mr. Francis with Critical and Historical Notes, Vol. 1.	Andrew Millar	Philip Francis	Not given	p. iv.	
1759	Various	Literary Memoirs of Germany and the North, Being a Choice Colletion of Essays on the Following Interesting Subjects…, Vol. 1, in 2 vols.	J. Warcus and J. Ross	Not given	Given as contributor		Contributed to this collection
1768	Not given	A List of the Society of Antiquaries	Not given	Not given	N/A		

Bibliography

Unpublished Primary Sources

British Library, London

Additional MS 6826 Letters to Mitchell from English Ambassadors in Russia 1756-1770

Additional MS 6839 Letters to Mitchell from Robert Symmer 1756-1763

Additional MS 6840 Letters to Mitchell from Dr. Patrick Murdoch

Additional MS 6858 Letters to Mitchell from Literary Persons, English and Foreign

Additional MS 6861 Letters to Mitchell from various Persons in England

Additional MS 15873 The Official Diplomatic Correspondence of James Dayrolle

Additional MS 52362 – Minute Book of the Egyptian Society

Supplementary Mitchell Papers

Volume 2, Additional MS 58284

Volume 7, Additional MS 58289

Volume 9, Additional MS 58291

Volume 37, Additional MS 58319

Volume 38, Additional MS 58320

Volume 39, Additional MS 58321

Burnett of Kemnay Papers, Kemnay House, Aberdeenshire

Bundles 24, 36, 54, 56, 57, 58, 62, 64, 65, 66, 71, 72, 74, 76, 77, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 119, 164, 216

Alexander Burnet Letter Books, Volume 7

Edinburgh University Library, Edinburgh

Dc.5.24 (1,2), Commonplace books of Charles Mackie

Dk.7.51, Paper on Charles Mackie, by L. W. Sharp

La.II.37, Lectures Notes Charles Mackie

La.II.90-91, Mackie Papers

La.II.302, Laing Papers

La.III.237, Mackie's Lecture Notes

La.III.558, Charles Mackie, Conspectus of Classical Authors

La.III.785, Charles Mackie, Lectures of Roman Antiquities

Hampshire Records Office

Malmesbury Papers

The National Archives, Kew, England

State Papers Prussia, SP90/65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 86, 87, 88

National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh

MS 2968 Forbes Papers

MS 2969 Forbes Papers

MS 7049-50, 7063, 7064 Yester Papers

Hume MSS 23155, 23156, 23158

National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh

GD1/609/2, 3, 4 Robert Craigie of Glendoick, Lord President – Various letters

GD18/5101 Papers of Clerk family of Penicuik, Midlothian – Whitehall. Letter to [Sir John Clerk] from Andrew Mitchell on the King's departure to the Continent, and on proceedings of the Royal Society

GD206/2 Papers of the Hall Family of Dunglass, East Lothian – Letters to and from Sir John Hall of Dunglass, 3rd Bart

GD214/638 Papers of Professor Robert K. Hannay – Letters to George Warrender of Bruntsfield from Andrew Mitchell [under-secretary for Scotland]

GD214/641 Papers of Professor Robert K. Hannay – Accounts and other papers relating to payments by Andrew Mitchell in connection with the illness and death of Hugh Warrender and the disposal of his effects

GD214/643 Papers of Professor Robert K. Hannay – Letter to George Warrender of Bruntsfield from Andrew Mitchell, Berlin, about the disposal of the residue of Hugh Warrender's effects

GD248/183, 185 Papers of the Ogilvy family, Earls of Seafield (Seafield Papers) – Grant Correspondence

GD248/562/55 Papers of the Ogilvy family, Earls of Seafield (Seafield Papers) – Seafield Correspondence, 1713-61, with letters of Lord Dupplin, 1754-66

GD248/565/83 Papers of the Ogilvy family, Earls of Seafield (Seafield Papers) – Seafield Correspondence 1726-[1790]

GD248/572/4 Papers of the Ogilvy family, Earls of Seafield (Seafield Papers) – Papers of James, 6th earl of Findlater

GD248/572/7 Papers of the Ogilvy family, Earls of Seafield (Seafield Papers) – Seafield Correspondence 1701-1754

GD248/591/2 Papers of the Ogilvy family, Earls of Seafield (Seafield Papers) – Seafield Correspondence, medical receipts, bills of exchanges, French and English accounts and related papers 1713-1791

GD345/1161 – Papers of the Grant family of Monymusk, Aberdeenshire – Letters to Sir Archibald Grant 1751-52

Royal Society, London

Royal Society Club Minutes 1/1 1748-51

Royal Society Club Minutes 1/1 1751-58

Journal Book Original, Volumes 17-19, 26-27
Society of Dilettanti, London
Society's Rules and Attendance Lists
Volumes of Minute Books
Membership Lists

Weston Library, Oxford
MS Eng. Misc. c.444 – Grand Tour Diary of Martin Folkes

Australian National University Library
Hume MSS 23156, 23158, Microfilm.

University of Adelaide
Society of Antiquaries, Minute Books, Microfilm, 11 reels, Vols 1-33 (London, 1980).

Published Primary Sources

Correspondence, Edited Books, Contemporary Books, Essays and Treatises

[Alexander Fraser Tytler of Woodhouselee], *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Honourable Henry Home of Kames,* 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1807).

Algarotti, F., *Il Newtonianismo per la dame ovvero Dialoghi sopra la luce e i colori* (Napoli, 1737).

Anon., *A Letter to the Society of Booksellers* (London, 1738).

Anon., *A Copy of the Royal Charter and Statutes of the Society of Antiquaries of London* (London, 1800).

Anon., *An Address to the College of Physicians, and to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge; Occasion'd by the late Swarms of Scotch and Leyden Physicians etc.* (London, 1747).

Anon., *A Selection from the Papers of the Earls of Marchmont, in the possession of The Right Honble Sir George Henry Rose, Illustrative of events from 1685 to 1750*, 3 vols., vol. 1 (London, 1831).

Anon., 'Authentick conversation between the king of Prussia and the ingenious Mr. Gellert, professor of Belles Lettres at Leipsick; extracted from a letter dated, Leipsick, January 27, 1761, in Annual Register, or a view of the history, politicks, and literature, of the year 1762 (London, 1763).

Anon., *Rump: Or an Exact Collection of the Choycest Poems and Songs Relating to the Late Times. By The Most Eminent Wits, From Anno 1639 to Anno 1661* (London, 1662).

Anon., *Sir John Fielding's Jests, or New Fun for the Parlour and the Kitchen* (London, 1781).

Anon., *The British Antidote to Caledonian Poison: Consisting of the most humorous Satirical Political Prints, for the Year 1762*, 5th ed. (London, 1763).

Anon, *The Scots Scourge: Being A Compleat Supplement to the British Antidote to the Caledonian Poison*, 2 Vols., Vol. 1, 6th ed. (London, 1765).

Anon., 'Society at Munich', in *Bentley's Miscellany*, Vol. 49 (London, 1861), pp. 544-552.

Anon., 'The account of Matthew Stewart, D. D. [Read by Mr John Playfair, April 3. 1786]', *Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, Vol. 1 (Edinburgh, 1788), Appendix, pp. 57-76.

Barbauld, A. L., ed, *The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, 6 vols., Vol. 5 (London, 1805).

Beaufort, L., de, *A Dissertation upon the Uncertainty of the Roman History during the First Five hundred Years*, Part 1 (London, 1740).

Bernoulli, J., *Lettres astronomiques où l'on donne une idée de l'état actuel de l'astronomie pratique dans plusiers villes de l'europe* (Berlin, 1771).

Bisset, A., *Memoirs and papers of Sir Andrew Mitchell, K. B.*, 2 vols. (London, 1850).

Blackwell, T., *Memoirs of the Court of Augustus*, 3 vols., Vol. 1 (Edinburgh, 1753)

Boswell, J., *The Life of Samuel Johnson*, 7th ed., 4 vols., Vol. 1, (London, 1811).

Briefe von Rabener und Gellert, wie auch des letzten Unterredung mit dem König von Preussen (Köln, 1761).

Briefwechsel Christian Fürchtegott Gellert's mit Demoiselle Lucius (Leipzig, 1823).

Brisson, M. J., *Dictionnaire Raisonné de Physique*, Vol. 4, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1798).

Brougham, H. Lord, *Lives of men of letters and science, who flourished in the time of George III* (London, 1845).

Burton, J. H., ed, *Life and Correspondence of David Hume,* 2 vols., Vol. 2 (Edinburgh, 1846).

----------., ed, *Letters of Eminent Persons addressed to David Hume* (Edinburgh and London, 1849).

'Cabinet Anatomique ou Collection des Préparations Anatomiques de feu M. Lieberkün, Médicin Prussien', *L'Année Littéraire*, Vols. 1-2, Vol. 2 (Amsterdam, 1764), pp. 136-140.

Campbell, T., ed, *Frederick the Great, his court and times*, 4 vols. (London, 1843).

Carlyle, T., *History of Friedrich II of Prussia, Called Frederick the Great*, 7 vols. (Boston, 1884).

----------., *History of Friedrich II. of Prussia, Called the Great*, Vol. 12 (Leipzig, 1865).

Catt, H. de, *Frederick the Great: The memoirs of his reader Henri de Catt 1758-1760*, Vol. 2, trans. F. S. Flint (London, 1905).

----------, 'Memoiren von Heinrich de Catt zur Geschichte des Siebenjährigen Krieges (1758-1760),' in Reinhold Koser, ed, Unterhaltungen mit Friedrich dem Großen: Memoiren und Tagebücher von Heinrich de Catt (Leipzig, 1884).

C. F. Gellert's Sämmtliche Schriften, 10 vols., Vol. 9 (Berlin and Leipzig, 1867).

Chr. F. Gellert's Tagebuch aus dem Jahre 1761 (Leipzig, 1862).

Chambers, R., *Smollett: his life and a selection from his writings* (London and Edinburgh, 1867).

Cicero, *De finibus bonorum et malorum*, trans. H. Rackham (London and Cambridge, MA, 1931).

Clarke, Rev. J. B. B., ed, *An account of the religious and literary life of Adam Clarke, LL.D, F.A.S, etc. etc.*, Vol. 1 (New York, 1837).

Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England, 12 vols., Vol. X, A. D. 1737-1739 (London, 1812).

Connoissance des temps pour l'année commune 1775 (Paris, 1774).

Constable, T., ed, *Archibald Constable and his Literary Correspondents: A Memorial, in three volumes*, Vol. 2 (Edinburgh, 1873).

Countess of Minto, *A Memoir of the Right Honourable Hugh Elliot* (Edinburgh, 1868).

Coxe, W., ed, *Memoirs of the administration of the right honourable Henry Pelham, collected from the family papers, and other authentic documents,* 2 vols. (London, 1829).

Cramer, J. A., *The life of Professor Gellert; with a course of moral lessons, delivered by him in the University of Leipsick*, trans. Mrs Douglas, 3 vols, Vol. 1 (London and Edinburgh, 1805).

Culloden Papers (London, 1815).

Danziger, M. K., ed, *James Boswell: The Journal of his Swiss and German Travels, 1764* (Edinburgh and New Haven, 2008).

Davy, J., ed, *The Collected Works of Sir Humphry Davy*, Vol. 1 (London, 1839).

Defoe, D., *The True-Born Englishman* (London, 1701).

Diary of Ernst Ahasverus von Lehndorff, in Wieland Giebel, ed, Die Tagebücher des Grafen Lehndorff. Die geheimen Auszeichnungen des Kammerhern der Königin Elisabeth Christine (Berlin, 2007).

Disraeli, I., *Miscellanies of literature*, 3 vols., Vol. 1 (New York, 1841).

Egan, P., *Grose's Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue* (London, 1823).

Ellis, H., ed, *Original Letters illustrative of English history*, 4 vols., Vol. 4 (London, 1827).

Encyclopaedia Londinensis; or, Universal Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, and Literature, Vol. 15 (London, 1817).

Erskine, Lord Grange, J., *Reasons against the Bill before the House of Lords for disabling the Lord Provost of the City of Edinburgh; to hold any Office of magistracy, and for fining the said City in L. 2000 Sterling* (London, 1737).

Fielding, H., *Amelia*, ed. Martin Battestin (Oxford, 1983).

Fraser, W., ed, *The Members of the Society of Dilettanti 1736-1874* (London, 1874).

Gebelin, F., and Morize, A., eds, *Correspondance de Montesquieu*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1914).

Gespräche Friedrichs des Großen mit Henri de Catt (Leipzig, 1885).

Giebel, W., ed, *Die Tagebücher des Grafen Lehndorff: die geheimen Aufzeichnungen des Kammerherrn der Königin Elisabeth Christine* (Berlin, 2007).

Gregory, D., *Elements of catoptrics and dioptrics*, trans. William Browne, 2nd ed. (London, 1735).

Greig, J. Y. T., ed, *The Letters of David Hume*, 2 vols., Vol. 1, 1727-1765 (Oxford, 1932).

Harris, J., (3rd earl), ed, *Diaries and Correspondence of James Harris, first earl of Malmesbury*, Vol. 1 (London, 1844).

Hempel, C. F., and Seyfart, J. F., *Helden- Staats- und Lebensgeschichte des Allerdurchlauchtigsten, und Grosmächtigsten Fürsten und Herrn, Friedrichs des Andern*, 7 vols., Vol. 6 (Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1762).

Hill, A., *The tears of the muses: a satire*, 2nd ed. (London, 1738).

Hill, G. B., ed, *Letters of Da vid Hume to William Strahan* (Oxford, 1888).

Hirzel an Gleim über Sulzer den Weltweisen, 2 vols. (Zürich and Winterthur, 1779).

Hume, D., *A Dissertation on the Passions. The Natural History of Religion: A critical edition*, ed. Tom L. Beauchamp (Oxford, 2007).

Jerdan, W., *Illustrations of the plan of a National Association for the Encouragement and Protection of Authors, and men of talent and genius* (London, 1839).

Johnson, S., *A Dictionary of the English Language*, 10th ed. (London, 1792).

----------., *A Dictionary of the English Language*, 8th ed., 2 vols., Vol. 2 (London, 1799).

Journals of the Hon. William Hervey, in North America and Europe, from 1755 to 1814 (Bury St. Edmund's, 1906).

Körte, W., ed, *Briefe der Schweizer Bodmer, Sulzer, Gessner: Aus Gleim's litterarischem Nachlasse* (Zürich, 1804).

Kugler, F., *The Pictorial History of Germany During the Reign of Frederick the Great* (London, 1845).

Lempriere, J., *Universal Biography*, 2 vols., Vol. 1 (New York, 1810).

Lessing, G., *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, ed. Friedrich Schröter and Richard Thiele (Halle, 1877).

Lewis, W., *Commercium Philosophico-Technicum; or, the Philosophical Commerce of Arts: designed as an attempt to improve Arts, Trades and Manufactures* (London, 1763).

London Magazine and Monthly Chronologer (London, 1737).

Maclaurin, C., 'A rule for finding the meridional parts to any spheroid, with the same exactness as in a sphere, by Colin Mac Laurin, F. R. S. communicated by Andrew Mitchel, Esq; F. R. S', *Philosophical Transactions*, 41 (1740), pp. 808-809.

----------., *An Account of Sir Isaac Newton's Philosophical Discoveries*, ed. P. Murdoch (London, 1748).

Mahon, Lord, ed, *The letters of Philip Dormer Stanhope, earl of Chesterfield*, 4 vols. (London, 1845).

Maty, M., ed, *Miscellaneous works of the late Philip Dormer Stanhope, earl of Chesterfield*, 3 vols. (Dublin, 1777).

McCosh, J., *The Scottish philosophy, biographical, expository, critical, from Hutcheson to Hamilton* (London, 1875).

McKillop, A. D., ed, *James Thomson (1700-1748). Letters and Documents* (Lawrence, 1958).

Mendelssohn, M., 'On the Question: What is Enlightenment?', originally published in Berlinische Monatsschrift, 4 (1784), pp. 193-200. Translated and published in James Schmidt, ed, *What is enlightenment? Eighteenth-century answers and twentieth-century questions* (Berkeley and London, 1996), pp. 53-57.

Mills, S., ed, *The collected letters of Colin Maclaurin* (Nantwich, 1982).

Minet, W., *Some account of the Huguenot family of Minet from their coming out of France at the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes MDCLXXXVI. Founded on Isaac Minet's 'Relation of our familly'* (London, 1892).

Monk, J. H., *The Life of Richard Bentley, D.D.*, 2 vols., Vol. 2 (London, 1833).

Nichols, J., *Biographical and Literary Anecdotes of William Bowyer* (London, 1782).

----------., *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, 6 vols., (London, 1812).

Nicolai, F., ed, *Anekdoten von Friedrich II. von Preussen, und von einigen Personen, die um Ihn waren*, 6 vols., Vol. 3 (Berlin and Stettin, 1790).

Nugent, T., *The Grand Tour, or, a journey through the Netherlands, Germany, Italy and France*, 2nd ed (London 1756).

Pococke, R., *Tours in Scotland, 1747, 1750, 1760*, ed. Daniel William Kemp, *Publications of the Scottish History Society*, Vol. 1 (1887, no place of publication).

Posthumous Works of Frederic II. King of Prussia, Vol. 13, Letters between Frederic II. The Prince of Prussia, and General Fouquet. Miscellanies., trans. Thomas Holcroft (London, 1789).

Pottle, F. A., *Boswell on the Grand Tour: Germany and Switzerland 1764* (Melbourne, London and Toronto, 1953).

Priestley, J., 'An Essay on a Course of Liberal Education for Civil and Active Life' (1764), pp. 1-3, in Joseph Priestley, Lectures on History and General Policy (London, 1793).

Pröhle, H., *Friedrich der Große und die deutsche Literatur* (Berlin, 1872).

Raumer, F. von, *Contributions to modern history, from the British Museum and the State Paper Office: Frederick II and his times* (London, 1837).

Reynolds, J. F., ed, *C. F. Gellerts Briefwechsel*, 4 vols., Vol. 3 (Berlin and New York, 1991).

Robertson, W., *The History of Scotland during the reigns of Queen Mary and of King James VI*, Volume 1, Book 1, new edition (London, 1781).

Rose, H. J., *A New General Dictionary*, 12 vols., Vol. 9 (London, 1853).

Schmidt-Lözen, K. E., ed, *Dreißig Jahre am Hofe Friedrichs des Großen: Aus den Tagebüchern des Reichsgrafen Ernst Ahasverus Heinrich von Lehndorff, Kammerherrn der Königin Elisabeth Christine von Preußen* (Gotha, 1907).

Sedgwick, R., ed, *Letters from George III to Lord Bute 1756-1766* (London, 1939).

Selections from the family papers preserved at Caldwell, Part II, Vols. 1 and 2 (Glasgow, 1854).

Selection of Reports and Papers of the House of Commons, Vol. 33, *Report from the Select Committee on the condition, management, and affairs of the British Museum; together with the minutes of evidence; appendix and index* (no place of publication, 1835).

Seyfart, J. F., *Lebens- und Regierungs-Geschichte Friedrichs des andern Königs in Preussen*, Part 2 (Leipzig, 1786).

Sheffield, J. L., Earl of, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Edward Gibbon*, Vol. 2 (London, 1830).

Short, J., 'Letter relating to a theorem of Mr. Euler, of the Royal Academy of sciences at Berlin, and F. R. S. for correcting the aberrations in the object-glasses of refracting telescopes', *Philosophical Transactions*, 48 (1753), pp. 287-296.

Smyth, W. H., *Sketch of the Rise and Progress of the Royal Society Club* (London, 1860).

Stanhope, W., and Pringle, J. H., eds, *Correspondence of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham*, Vols. 1-3 (London, 1838-1839).

Stewart, M., *The distance of the sun from the earth determined by the theory of gravity* (Edinburgh, 1763).

Supplement to the Letters written by the late Right Honourable Philip Dormer Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield, to his son, Philip Stanhope, esq (London, 1787).

Thiébault, D., *Original Anecdotes of Frederic the Second, King of Prussia*, 2 vols. (London, 1805).

----------., *Original Anecdotes of Frederick the Great, King of Prussia*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1806).

Towers, J., *An Essay on the Life and Character of Dr. Samuel Johnson* (London, 1786).

----------, *Memoirs of the life and reign of Frederick the Third, King of Prussia*, 2 vols., Vol. 2 (London, 1787).

The Athenaeum, June 29, 1850, no. 1183, in *The Athenaeum Journal of literature, science, and the fine arts. For the year 1850* (London, 1850)

The Gentleman's Magazine and Historical Chronicle, Vol. 52 (London, 1782).

The history, debates, and proceedings of both Houses of Parliament of Great Britain, from the year 1743 to the year 1774, 7 vols., Vol. 3 (London, 1792).

The History of the Proceedings of the House of Lords from the Restoration in 1660 to the Present Time (London, 1742).

The life and labours of Adam Clarke, LL.D., 2nd ed. (London, 1842).

The London Encyclopaedia, or Universal Dictionary of Science, Art, Literature, and Practical Mechanics, Vol. 7 (London, 1829).

The Monthly Repository and Review of Theology and General Literature, Vol. 3 (London, 1829).

The Quarterly Review, Vol. 103 (London, 1858).

The Tatler, 12 October 1710, No. 236 (London, 1794).

The Works of James Thomson, in Two Volumes, 2 vols., Vol. 1 (London, 1762).

The Works of Lord Chesterfield including his Letters to his son etc. to which is prefixed an original life of the author (New York, 1853).

The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence, 48 vols. (New Haven, 1937-1983).

Turner, R. S., ed, *Horace Walpole's marginal notes, written in Dr. Maty's Miscellaneous Works and Memoirs of the Earl of Chesterfield* (place and date of publication unknown).

Vehse, E., *Geschichte der Hofe der Haüser Baiern, Würtemberg, Baden und Hessen*, Part 3 (Hamburg, 1853).

----------, Memoirs of the court of Prussia, trans. Franz C. F. Demmler (London, 1854).

Wallace, G., 'Memoirs of Dr Wallace of Edinburgh', *The Scots Magazine*, Vol. xxxiii, (Edinburgh, 1771), pp. 340-344.

Walpole, H., *Memoires of the last ten years of the reign of George the Second*, Vol. 1 (London, 1822), in *The Works of Horatio Walpole, Earl of Orford*, Vol. 7 (London, 1822).

----------., *Memoires of the last ten years of the reign of George the Second*, 2 vols., Vol. 1 (London, 1823).

----------., *Memoirs of the reign of George the Second*, 2 vols., Vol. 1 (London, 1846).

Weld, C. R., *A History of the Royal Society*, Vol. 1 (London, 1848).

Wilson, J., 'Preface' in *Mathematical tracts of the late Benjamin Robins, esq.*, 2 vols., Vol. 1 (London, 1761).

Wraxall, N., *Historical memoirs of my own time* (London, 1904).

Zimmermann, J. G., *Select views of the life, reign and character of Frederick the Great, King of Prussia*, trans. Major Neuman, Vol. 1 (London, 1792).

Websites

Euler's Correspondence with Johann Kaspar Wettstein, at http://eulerarchive.maa.org/correspondence/correspondents/Wettstein_en.html

Political Correspondence of Frederick the Great, 46 vols., at http://friedrich.uni-trier.de/de/politKorr/toc/

Preuss, J. D. E., ed, Oeuvres de Frédéric le Grand, 30 vols., at http://friedrich.uni-trier.de/de/oeuvres/toc/

Registers of the Berlin Academy of Sciences 1746-1786, 'Sitzungsprotokollen' at http://akademieregistres.bbaw.de/exist/apps/SadeRegistres/index.html

Secondary Sources

Books, Book Chapters, Conference Papers, Edited Books, Journal Articles, Theses

Anderson, B., *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*, rev. ed. (London and New York, 2006).

Aspaas, P. P., 'The use of Latin and the European Republic of Letters: Change and continuity in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries', *Nordlit*, 33 (2014), pp. 281-295.

Asprey, R., *Frederick the Great: The magnificent enigma* (New York, 1986).

Atto, C., 'The Society for the Encouragement of Learning,' *The Library*, Fourth Series, 19 (1938), pp. 263-288.

Ayling, S., *The elder Pitt, Earl of Chatham* (New York, 1976).

Ayres, P. J., *Classical culture and the idea of Rome in eighteenth century England* (Cambridge, 1997).

Bachelard, G., *The poetics of space* (Paris, 1958; Boston, 1994).

Barber, P., 'Maps and monarchs in Europe 1500-1800', in Robert Oresko, G. C. Gibbs and H. M. Scott, eds, *Royal and republican sovereignty in early modern Europe: essays in memory of Ragnhild Hatton* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 75-124.

Baron, C. K. 'Transitions, transformations, reversals: Rethinking Bach's world', in Carol K. Baron, ed, *Bach's changing world: Voices in the community* (Rochester and Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 1-34.

Barrell, R. A., *Chesterfield et la France* (Paris, 1968).

----------., *Bolingbroke and France* (Lanham, New York and London, 1988).

Beachy, R., 'The alchemy of credit: Saxony's *Rétablissement* after 1763', in Ute Planert and James Retallack, eds, *Decades of reconstruction: Postwar societies, state-building, and international relations from the Seven Years' War to the Cold War* (Cambridge, 2017), pp. 141-157.

Beaglehole, J. C., 'Cook the Navigator', *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 314 (1969), pp. 27-38.

Beales, D., *Joseph II*, Vol. 1, *In the shadow of Maria Theresa 1741-1780* (Cambridge, 1987).

Beer, Sir G. de, *The sciences were never at war* (London, Edinburgh, Paris, Melbourne, Johannesburg, Toronto and New York, 1960).

Behre, G., 'Jacobite refugees in Gothenburg after Culloden', *Scottish Historical Review*, 70 (1991), pp. 58-65.

Belanger, T., 'Publishers and writers in eighteenth-century England', in Isabel Rivers, ed, *Books and their readers in eighteenth-century England* (New York, 1982), pp. 5-26.

Bellhouse, D. R., 'Lord Stanhope's papers on the doctrine of chances', *Historia Mathematica*, 34 (2007), pp. 173-186.

----------., *Abraham de Moivre: Setting the stage for classical probability and its applications* (Boca Raton, London and New York, 2011).

Benz, M. J., 'Johann Georg Sulzer. Aufklärung zwischen Christian Wolff und David Hume (*Internationale Arbeitsagung in Halle [Saale] v. 12-14.2.2009), Zeitschrift für Germanistik*, 19 (2009), pp. 639-641.

Berg, D. M., *The correspondence of Christian Gottfried Krause: A music lover in the age of sensibility* (Farnham and Burlington, 2009).

Berlin, I., 'Hume and German anti-rationalism', in *Against the current: Essays in the history of ideas*, ed. Henry Hardy (New York, 1980).

Birgfeld, J., 'Unfreiwillige Politisierung der Literatur oder Rechtverstoß als Erfolgsstrategie. Rabener und Gellert als Opfer eines sächsisch-patriotischen Verlegers', in Claude D. Conter, ed, *Justitiabilität und Rechtmäßigkeit. Verrechtlichungsprozesse von Literatur und Film in der Moderne* (Amsterdam and New York, 2010), pp. 149-168.

Black, J., 'Introduction: An age of political stability?' in Jeremy Black, ed, *Britain in the age of Walpole* (Houndmills and London, 1984), pp. 1-22.

----------., 'British foreign policy in the eighteenth century: A survey', *Journal of British Studies*, 26 (1987), pp. 26-53.

----------., 'Foreign policy and the British state 1742-1793', in Jeremy Black, ed, *British politics and society from Walpole to Pitt 1742-1789* (London, 1990), pp. 147-176.

----------., *Robert Walpole and the nature of politics in early eighteenth-century Britain* (New York, 1990).

----------., *Pitt the Elder* (Cambridge, 1992).

----------., *The politics of Britain 1688-1800* (Manchester and New York, 1993).

----------., *America or Europe?: British foreign policy, 1739-63* (London, 1998).

----------., *British diplomats and diplomacy* (Exeter, 2001).

----------., *Eighteenth-century Britain 1688-1783* (Houndmills and London, 2001).

----------., *Parliament and foreign policy in the eighteenth century* (Cambridge, 2004).

----------., *The Hanoverians: The history of a dynasty* (London and New York, 2004).

----------., *George III: America's last king* (New Haven and London, 2006).

----------., *A history of diplomacy* (London, 2010).

----------., *Debating foreign policy in eighteenth-century Britain* (Farnham and Burlington, 2011).

----------., *British politics and foreign policy, 1744-1757: Mid-century crisis* (London and New York, 2015).

----------, and Schweizer, K. W., 'The value of diplomatic history: A case study in the historical thought of Herbert Butterfield', *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 17 (2006), pp. 617-631.

Blanning, T. C. W., 'Frederick the Great and enlightened absolutism' in H. M. Scott, ed, *Enlightened absolutism: Reform and reformers in later eighteenth-century Europe* (Houndmills and London, 1990), pp. 265-288.

----------., 'Frederick the Great and German culture', in Robert Oresko, G. C. Gibbs, and H. M. Scott, eds, *Royal and republican sovereignty in early modern Europe: essays in memory of Ragnhild Hatton* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 527-550.

----------., *The culture of power and the power of culture: Old regime Europe 1660-1789* (Oxford, 2002).

----------., *Frederick the Great: King of Prussia* (London, 2015).

Boogert, M. H. van den, 'Russell and the Republic of Letters in Aleppo', in Alastair Hamilton, Maurits H. van den Boogert, and Bart Westerweel, eds, *The Republic of Letters and the Levant* (Leiden and Boston, 2005), pp. 223-264.

Bord, J., *Science and Whig manners: Science and political style in Britain, c. 1790-1850* (Houndmills, 2009).

Boyle, N., *German literature: A very short introduction* (Oxford, 2008).

Brenton, T., 'The Ambassador, the Grand Duke, his wife and her lover', *History Today* (2008), pp. 14-19.

Brewer, D., 'Lights in space', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 37 (2004), pp. 171-186.

Brewer, J., *The sinews of power: War, money, and the English state, 1688-1783* (London, Boston, Sydney and Wellington, 1989).

----------., Pleasures of the imagination: English culture in the eighteenth century (London, 1997).

Bricke, M. S., 'The Pelhams vs. Argyll: A struggle for mastery of Scotland, 1747-1748', *Scottish Historical Review*, 61 (1982), pp. 157-165.

Britt, C. B., 'Critical introduction and textual history', in Sophie von LaRoche, *The history of Lady Sophia Sternheim*, trans. and critical introduction Christa Baguss Britt (Albany, 1991), pp. 3-42.

Brown, F. A., *Gotthold Ephraim Lessing* (New York, 1971).

Brown, H., *Benedikte Naubert (1756-1819) and her relations to English culture* (London, 2005).

----------., Luise Gottsched the translator (Rochester, NY, 2012).

Brown, I. G., 'Precarious preferment in Apollo's favourite residence: London as focus for Sir

John Clerk's political and cultural ambition', in Stana Nenadic, ed, *Scots in London in the Eighteenth Century* (Lewisburg, 2010), pp. 49-72.

Browning, R., *The Duke of Newcastle* (New Haven, 1975).

----------., *Political and constitutional ideas of the Court Whigs* (Baton Rouge, Los Angeles and London, 1982).

Buchan, J., *Capital of the mind: How Edinburgh changed the world* (London, 2004).

Budd, A., 'Men of consequence: Whimsical David Hume, politician and man of business: an unpublished letter', *TLS*, 23 January 2015, pp. 14-15.

Burling, W. J., *A checklist of new plays and entertainments on the London stage, 1700-1737* (London and Toronto, 1993).

Burrows, D., and Dunhill, R., *Music and theatre in Handel's world: The family papers of James Harris, 1732-1780* (Oxford, 2002).

Carey, D., *Locke, Shaftesbury and Hutcheson: Contesting diversity in the Enlightenment and beyond* (Cambridge, 2005).

Cairns, J. W., 'Legal study in Utrecht in the late 1740s: The education of Sir David Dalrymple, Lord Hailes', *Fundamina*, 8 (2002), pp. 30-73.

----------., 'Legal theory', in Alexander Broadie, ed, *The Cambridge companion to the Scottish Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 222-242.

----------., 'The first Edinburgh chair in law: Grotius and the Scottish Enlightenment', *Fundamina*, 11 (2005), pp. 31-57.

----------., *Law, lawyers, and humanism: Selected essays on the history of Scots law*, 2 vols., Vol. 1 (Edinburgh, 2015).

Calinger, R. S., 'Frederick the Great and the Berlin Academy of Sciences (1740-1766)', *Annals of Science*, 24 (1968), pp. 239-249.

----------., 'The Newtonian-Wolffian Controversy: 1740-1759', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 30 (1969), pp. 319-330.

----------., *Leonhard Euler: Mathematical genius in the Enlightenment* (Princeton and Oxford, 2016).

Cannon, J., *Aristocratic century: The peerage of eighteenth-century England* (Cambridge, 1984).

Carruthers, G., 'James Thomson and eighteenth-century Scottish literary identity', in Richard Terry, ed, *James Thomson: Essays for the tercentenary* (Liverpool, 2000), pp. 165-190.

Carter, H. B., 'The Royal Society and the voyage of HMS 'Endeavour' 1768-71', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, 49 (1995), pp. 245-260.

Casali, S., 'The king of pain: Aeneas, Achates and 'Achos' in 'Aeineid' 1', *The Classical Quarterly*,

58 (2008), pp. 181-189.

Caudle, J. J., 'James Boswell (H. Scoticus Londoniensis)' in Stana Nenadic, ed, *Scots in London in the eighteenth century* (Lewisburg, 2010), pp. 109-138.

Chance, B. A. 'Sensibilism, psychologism, and Kant's debt to Hume', *Kantian Review*, 16 (2011), pp. 325-349.

Christie, J. R. R., and Golinski, J. V., 'The spreading of the word: New directions in the historiography of chemistry 1600-1800', *History of Science*, 20 (1982), pp. 235-266.

Churton Collins, J., *Voltaire, Montesquieu and Rousseau in England* (London, 1908, reprinted 1980).

Clark, J. C. D., 'A general theory of party, opposition and government, 1688-1832', *The Historical Journal*, 23 (1980), pp. 295-325.

----------., *The dynamics of change: The crisis of the 1750s and English party systems* (Cambridge, 1982).

Clark, P., *British clubs and societies 1580-1800: The origins of an associational world* (Oxford, 2000).

Clark, W., 'The death of metaphysics in enlightened Prussia', in William Clark, Jan Golinski, and Simon Schaffer, eds, *The sciences in enlightened Europe* (Chicago and London, 1999), pp. 423-473.

----------., 'The prosopography of science', in Roy Porter, ed, *The Cambridge history of science*, Vol. 4, Eighteenth-century science (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 211-240.

Clausen, W. V., *Virgil's Aeneid: Decorum, allusion, and ideology* (Leipzig, 2002).

Clendenning, P. H., 'Dr. Thomas Dimsdale and smallpox inoculation in Russia', *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*, 2 (1973), pp. 109-125.

Colley, L., *Britons: Forging the nation 1707-1837*, rev. ed. (New Haven and London, 2009).

Connell, P., 'Death and the author: Westminster Abbey and the meanings of the literary monument', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 38 (2005), pp. 557-585.

Corfield, P. J., *Power and the professions in Britain 1700-1850* (London and New York, 1995).

Cox, O. J. W., 'Frederick, Prince of Wales, and the first performance of 'Rule, Britannia!'', *The Historical Journal*, 56 (2013), pp. 931-954.

Crawford, R., *Devolving English literature* (Oxford, 1992).

Crosland, M., 'Relationships between the Royal Society and the Academie des Sciences in the late eighteenth century', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, 59 (2005), pp. 25-34.

Cruickshanks, E., 'Tory and Whig 'Patriots': Lord Gower and Lord Chesterfield', in Jonathan Clark and Howard Erskine-Hill, eds, *Samuel Johnson in historical context* (Houndmills and New York, 2002), pp. 146-168.

Cust, L., *History of the Society of Dilettanti*, ed. Sidney Colvin (London, 1914).

Cuthell, E. E., *Wilhelmina: Margravine of Baireuth*, 2 vols. (London, 1905).

Damrosch, L., *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: Restless genius* (Boston and New York, 2005).

Danziger, M. K., 'Boswell's travels through the German, Swiss, and French Enlightenment', in Irma S. Lustig, ed, *Boswell: Citizen of the world, man of letters* (Lexington, 1995), pp. 13-36.

Darnton, R., 'What is the history of books?', *Daedalus*, 111 (1982), pp. 65-83.

Daunicht, R., ed, *Lessing im Gespräch. Berichte und Urteile von Freunden und Zeitgenossen* (München, 1971).

Davie, G. E., 'Hume and the origins of the Common Sense School', in John Dunn and Ian Harris, eds, *Hume*, 2 vols., Vol. 1 (Cheltenham and Lyme, 1997), pp. 61-69.

Devine, T. M., *The Scottish nation 1700-2000* (London, 1999).

Dewhirst, D. W., 'Observatories and instrument makers in the eighteenth century', in Arthur Beer, ed, *Vistas in astronomy*, Vol. 1 (Oxford, London, New York and Paris, 1955), pp. 139-143.

Dickinson, H. T., and Logue, K. J., 'The Porteous Riot, 1736: Events in a Scottish protest against the act of union with England', *History Today*, 22 (1972), pp. 272-281.

----------., 'Whiggism in the eighteenth century', in John Cannon, ed, *The Whig ascendancy: Colloquies on Hanoverian England* (London, 1981), pp. 28-44.

----------., 'Popular Politics in the age of Walpole', in Jeremy Black, ed, Britain in the Age of Walpole (Basingstoke and London, 1992), pp. 45-68.

----------., *The politics of the people in eighteenth-century Britain* (Houndmills and London, 1994).

Dilthey, W., 'Frederick and the Academy', in Peter Paret, ed, *Frederick the Great: A profile* (London and Basingstoke, 1972), pp. 177-197.

Doran, P. F., *Andrew Mitchell and Anglo-Prussian relations during the Seven Years War* (New York and London, 1986).

Duveen, D. I., and Klickstein, H. S., 'Benjamin Franklin (1706-1790) and Antoine Laurent Lavoisier (1743-1794)', *Annals of Science*, 11 (1955), pp. 271-302.

Emerson, R. L., 'The Philosophical Society of Edinburgh, 1737-1747', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, 12 (1979), pp. 151-191.

----------., 'Science and moral philosophy in the Scottish Enlightenment', in M. A. Stewart, ed, *Studies in the philosophy of the Scottish Enlightenment* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 11-36.

----------., 'The "affair" at Edinburgh and the "project" at Glasgow: the politics of Hume's attempts to become a professor', in M. A. Stewart and John P. Wright, eds, *Hume and Hume's connexions* (Edinburgh, 1994), pp. 1-22.

----------., *Academic patronage in the Scottish enlightenment: Glasgow, Edinburgh and St Andrews Universities* (Edinburgh, 2008).

----------., 'The Scottish contexts for David Hume's political-economic thinking', in Carl Wennerlind and Margaret Schabas, eds, *David Hume's political economy* (Abingdon and New York, 2008), pp. 10-32.

----------., *Essays on David Hume, medical men and the Scottish Enlightenment* (Farnham And Burlington, 2009).

Engbers, J., *Der "Moral-Sense" bei Gellert, Lessing und Wieland. Zur Rezeption von Shaftesbury und Hutcheson in Deutschland* (Heidelberg, 2001).

Eskildsen, K. R., 'How Germany left the Republic of Letters', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 65 (2004), pp. 421-432.

Fabian, B., 'The beginnings of the English-language publishing in Germany in the eighteenth century', in Kenneth E. Carpenter, ed, *Books and society in history: Papers of the Association of College and Research Libraries Rare Books and Manuscripts preconference* (New York and London, 1983), pp. 115-143.

----------., 'Modes of transmission', in Bernhard Fabian, *The English book in eighteenth-century Germany*, The Panizzi Lectures (London, 1991), pp. 37-76.

----------., 'The discovery of English culture', in *Bernhard Fabian, The English book in eighteenth-century Germany,* The Panizzi Lectures (London, 1991), pp. 1-36.

----------., 'Translators and intermediaries', in Bernhard Fabian, *The English book in eighteenth-century Germany*, The Panizzi Lectures (London, 1991), pp. 77-110.

----------., 'English books and their eighteenth-century German readers', in Bernhard Fabian, *Selecta Anglicana: Buchgeschichtliche Studien zur Aufnahme der English Literatur in Deutschland im achtzehnten jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden, 1994), pp. 11-95.

----------., 'Nicolai und England', in Bernhard Fabian, *Selecta Anglicana: Buchgeschichtliche Studien zur Aufnahme der English Literatur in Deutschland im achtzehnten jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden, 1994), pp. 195-215.

Feather, J., 'The commerce of letters: The study of the eighteenth century book trade', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 17 (1984), pp. 405-424.

----------., 'British publishing in the eighteenth century: a preliminary subject analysis', *The Library*, s6-VIII (1986), pp. 32-46.

Fellmann, 'Leonhard Eulers stellung in der Geschichte der Optik' in E. A. Fellmann, ed, *Leonhard Euler 1707-1783. Beiträge zu Leben und Werk* (Basel, 1983), pp. 303-330.

----------., *Leonhard Euler*, trans. Erika Gautschi and Walter Gautschi (Basel, Boston and

Berlin, 2007).

Fenves, P., 'Politics of friendship, once again', *Eighteenth-Century Studies* (1998/1999), pp. 133-155.

Fieser, J., ed, *Early responses to Hume's life and reputation*, rev. 2nd ed, Vol. 1 (Bristol, 2003).

Finger, S., and Piccolino, M., *The shocking history of electric fishes: From ancient epochs to the birth of modern neurophysiology* (Oxford, 2011).

Fischer, B., and Fox, T. C., 'Lessing's life and work', in Barbara Fischer and Thomas C. Fox, eds, *A companion to the works of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing* (Rochester, NY and Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 13-40.

Fontes da Costa, P., 'The culture of curiosity at the Royal Society in the first half of the eighteenth century', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, 56 (2002), pp. 147-166.

Forbes, E. G., 'The life and work of Tobias Mayer (1723-62), *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 8 (1967), pp. 227-251.

Fulton, H. L., *Dr. John Moore, 1729-1802: A life in medicine, travel, and revolution* (Newark, 2015).

Garland, M., 'Le subside de la Barrière après la guerre de Succession d'Autriche: 'L'affaire des Quatorze cent mille florins'', *Revue belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, 67 (1989), pp. 283-298.

Garland, H., and Garland, M., *The Oxford companion to German literature* (Oxford, 1976).

Garrett, A., 'Hutcheson on the unity of virtue and right' in Elizabeth Robinson and Chris W. Suprenant, eds, *Kant and the Scottish enlightenment* (New York and Abingdon, 2017), pp. 19-35.

Gascoigne, J., *Joseph Banks and the English enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1994).

----------., *Science in the service of empire: Joseph Banks, the British state, and the uses of science in the age of revolution* (Cambridge, 1998).

----------., 'The Royal Society and the emergence of science as an instrument of state policy', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, 32 (1999), pp. 171-184.

----------., *The enlightenment and the origins of European Australia* (Cambridge, 2002).

----------., *Encountering the Pacific in the age of the enlightenment* (Cambridge, 2014).

Gaskin, J. C. A., 'Hume suppressed dissertations: An authentic text', *Hermathena*, 106 (1968), pp. 54-59.

Gasper, J., *The Marquis d'Argens: A philosophical life* (Lanham, 2014).

Gee, B., *Francis Watkins and the Dollond telescope patent controversy*, ed. Anita McConnell and A. D. Morrison-Low (London and New York, 2014).

Gerrard, C., *The patriot opposition to Walpole: Politics, poetry, and national myth, 1725-1742* (Oxford, 1994).

----------., *Aaron Hill: Muses projector 1685-1750* (Oxford, 2003).

Gibbs, F. W., 'William Lewis and platina: Bicentenary of the 'Commercium Philosophico Technicum'', *Platinum Metals Review*, 7 (1963), pp. 66-69.

Goldgar, A., *Impolite learning: Conduct and community in the Republic of Letters, 1680-1750* (New Haven and London, 1995).

Golinski, J. V., 'Utility and audience in eighteenth-century chemistry: Case studies of William Cullen and Joseph Priestley', *British Journal for the History of Science*, 21 (1988), pp. 1-31.

----------., 'Chemistry in the Scientific Revolution: Problems of language and communication', in David C. Lindberg and Robert S. Westman, eds, *Reappraisals of the Scientific Revolution* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 367-396.

----------., *Science as public culture: Chemistry and enlightenment in Britain, 1760-1820* (Cambridge, 1999).

----------., 'Science in the enlightenment, revisited', *History of Science*, 49 (2011), pp. 217-231.

Gooch, G. P., *Frederick the Great: The ruler, the writer, the man* (London, New York and Toronto, 1947).

Goodman, E., *The portraits of Madame de Pompadour: Celebrating the femme savant* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 2000).

Griffin, D., *Literary patronage in England, 1650-1800* (Cambridge, 1996).

Grimsley, R., 'D'Alembert at Potsdam (1763): An English Comment', in *Revue de Littérature Comparée,* 35 (1961), pp. 114-115.

----------., *Jean d'Alembert (1717-1783)* (Oxford, 1963).

Grundolf, F., 'Frederick's essay on German literature', in Peter Paret, ed, *Frederick the Great: A profile* (London and Basingstoke, 1972), pp. 199-217.

Grundy, I., 'Medical advance and female fame: Inoculation and its after-effects', *Érudit*, 13 (1994), pp. 13-42.

Grunert, H. F., and Stiening, G., eds, *Johann Georg Sulzer (1720-1779). Aufklärer zwischen Christian Wolff und David Hume* (Berlin, 2011).

Guerrini, A., ''A Scotsman on the make: The career of Alexander Stuart', in Paul Wood, ed, *The Scottish Enlightenment: Essays in reinterpretation* (Rochester and Suffolk, 2000), pp. 157-176.

----------., 'Scots in London medicine in the early eighteenth century', in Stana Nenadic, ed, *Scots in London in the eighteenth century* (Lewisburg, 2010), pp. 165-185.

Gulick, Jr, S. L., 'The publication of Chesterfield's letters to his son', *PMLA*, 51 (1936), pp. 165-177.

Guthrie, J., 'Eighteenth-century German translations of Pope's poetry', *Publications of the English Goethe Society*, 82 (2013), pp. 67-84.

Haar, E. van de, *Classical liberalism and international relations theory: Hume, Smith, Mises and Hayek* (New York, 2009).

Haakonssen, K., 'Natural jurisprudence and the identity in the Scottish Enlightenment', in Ruth Savage, ed, *Philosophy and religion in enlightenment Britain* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 258-278.

Habashi, F., 'Christlieb Ehregott Gellert and his metallurgic chymistry', *Bulletin of the History of Chemistry*, 24 (1999), pp. 32-39.

Halsband, R., *Lord Hervey: Eighteenth-century courtier* (New York and Oxford, 1974).

Harding, N., *Hanover and the British empire, 1700-1837* (Woodbridge, 2007).

Harris, B., *Politics and the nation: Britain in the mid-eighteenth century* (Oxford, 2002).

Hargraves, N., 'Revelation of character in eighteenth-century historiography and William Robertson's History of the Reign of Charles V', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 27 (2003), pp. 23-48.

Hay, D., 'The Historiographers Royal in England and Scotland', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 30 (1951), pp. 19-33.

Hay, D., 'Muratori and the British historians', *Renaissance Essays* (London, 1988), pp. 85-102.

Heilbron, J. L., 'Robert Symmer and the two electricities', *Isis*, 67 (1976), pp. 7-20.

----------., *Electricity in the 17th & 18th centuries: A study of early modern physics* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1979).

----------., *Elements of early modern physics* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1982).

Heinzelmann, J. H., 'Pope in Germany in the eighteenth century', *Modern Philology*, 10 (1913), pp. 317-364.

Henrich, D., 'Hutcheson and Kant', in Karl Ameriks and Otfried Höffe, eds, Nicholas Walker, trans., *Kant's Moral and Legal Philosophy* (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 29-57.

Hewitt, R., *Map of a nation* (London, 2010).

----------., 'A family affair: The Dundas family of Arniston and the military survey of Scotland (1747-1755)', *Imago Mundi*, 64 (2012), pp. 60-77.

Hill, B., 'Parliament, parties and elections (1688-1760)', in H. T. Dickinson, ed, *A companion to eighteenth-century Britain* (Malden and Oxford, 2002), pp. 55-68.

Hoare, M. E., *The tactless philosopher: Johann Reinhold Forster* (1729-98) (Melbourne, 1976).

Hochadel, O., *Öffentliche Wissenschaft: Elektrizität in der deutschen Aufklärung* (Göttingen, 2003).

Hochstrasser, T., 'Jean Henri Samuel Formey (1711-97)', in Heiner F. Klemme and Manfred Kuehn, eds, *The Bloomsbury Dictionary of Eighteenth-Century German Philosophers* (London and New York, 2010), pp. 225-227.

Holmes, G., 'Colloquy on Chapter 3', in John Cannon, ed, *The Whig ascendancy: Colloquies on*

Hanoverian England (London, 1981), pp. 71-75.

Horn, D. B., *Sir Charles Hanbury Williams and European diplomacy, 1748-1759* (London, 1930).

----------., *British diplomatic representatives 1689-1789* (London, 1932).

----------., 'Scottish diplomatists 1689-1789', *Historical Association Publications* (1944), pp. 3-18.

----------., *The British diplomatic service, 1689-1789* (Oxford, 1961).

Hufbauer, K., 'Social support for chemistry in Germany during the eighteenth century: How and why did it change?', *Historical Studies in the Physical Sciences*, 3 (1971), pp. 205-231.

----------., *The formation of the German chemical community (1720-1795)* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1982).

Hutton, S., 'Science for ladies? Elizabeth Carter's translation of Algarotti and 'popular' Newtonianism in the eighteenth century', in Elizabethanne Boran and Mordechai Feingold, eds, *Reading Newton in early modern Europe* (Leiden and Boston, 2017), pp. 102-115.

Israel, J., *Democratic enlightenment: Philosophy, revolution, and human rights 1750-1790* (Oxford, 2011).

Jacobs, M. C., and Stewart, L., *Practical matter: Newton's science in the service of industry and empire, 1687-1851* (Cambridge, MA and London, 2004).

Johnson, H. C., *Frederick the Great and his officials* (New Haven and London, 1975).

Jones, C., 'The Duke of Newcastle's letters on the fall of Walpole in 1742', *Electronic British Library Journal* (2013), pp. 1-9.

Jones, W. P., *The rhetoric of science: A study of scientific ideas and imagery in eighteenth century English poetry* (London, 1966).

Jones, P., 'The Scottish professoriate and the polite academy', in Istvan Hont and Michael Ignatieff, eds, *Wealth and virtue: The shaping of political economy in the Scottish enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 89-118.

Jung, S., *David Mallet, Anglo-Scot: Poetry, patronage, and politics in the age of union* (Newark, 2008).

----------., "Staging' an Anglo-Scottish identity: The early career of David Mallet, poet and playwright in London', in Stana Nenadic, ed, *Scots in London in the Eighteenth Century* (Lewisburg, 2010), pp. 73-90.

Jungnickel, C., and McCormmach, R., *Cavendish: The experimental life* (Lewisburg, 1999).

Juskevic, A. P., and Winter, E., eds, *Die Berliner und die Petersburger Akademie der Wissenschaften im Briefwechsel Leonhard Eulers*, Teil 3, *Wissenschaftliche und Wissenschaftsorganisatorie Korrespondenzen 1726-1774* (Berlin, 1976).

Kagel, M., 'Brothers or others: Male friendship in eighteenth-century Germany', *Colloquia Germanica*, 40 (2007), pp. 213-235.

Kaplan, H. H., *Russia and the outbreak of the Seven Years' War* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1968).

Kaufmann, W. A., 'Goethe and the history of ideas', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 10 (1949), pp. 503-516.

Kelch, R. A., *Newcastle: A Duke without money: Thomas Pelham-Holles 1693-1768* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1974).

Kelly, J., 'Riots, revelries, and rumor': Libertinism and masculine association in enlightenment London', *Journal of British Studies*, 45 (2006), pp. 759-795.

----------., *The Society of Dilettanti: Archaeology and identity in the British enlightenment* (New Haven and London, 2009).

Kidd, C., 'North Britishness and the nature of eighteenth-century British patriotisms', *The Historical Journal*, 39 (1996), pp. 361-382.

Kimball, B. A., *The 'True professional ideal' in America: A history* (Lanham and London, 1995).

King, H. C., 'The invention and early development of the achromatic telescope', *Popular Astronomy*, 56 (1948), pp. 75-88.

Klein, L. E., 'Liberty, manners, and politeness in early eighteenth-century England', *The Historical Journal*, 32 (1989), pp. 583-605.

----------., 'Sociability, solitude, and enthusiasm', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 60 (1997), pp. 153-177.

----------., 'The figure of France: The politics of sociability in England, 1660-1715', *Yale French Studies*, 92 (1997), pp. 30-45.

----------., 'Politeness and the interpretation of the British eighteenth century', *The Historical Journal*, 45 (2002), pp. 869-898.

Klein, U., 'Apothecary-chemists in eighteenth-century Germany', in Lawrence M. Principe, ed, *New narratives in eighteenth-century chemistry. Contributions from the first Francis Bacon workshop, 21-23 April 2005, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California* (Dordrecht, 2007), pp. 97-137.

----------., 'The laboratory challenge: Some revisions of the standard view of early modern experimentation', *Isis*, 99 (2008), pp. 769-782.

----------., 'Savant officials in the Prussian mining administration', *Annals of Science*, 69 (2012), pp. 349-374.

----------., 'The Prussian mining official Alexander von Humboldt', *Annals of Science*, 69 (2012), pp. 27-68.

Klemme, H. F., and Kuehn, M., 'General Introduction', in Heiner F. Klemme and Manfred Kuehn, eds, *The reception of British aesthetics in Germany: Seven significant translations, 1745-*

1776, Vol. 1 (Bristol, 2001), pp. v-ix.

Klibansky, R., and Mossner, E. C., eds, *New letters of David Hume* (Oxford, 1954).

Kohl, K., 'Hero or villain? The response of German authors to Frederick the Great', *Publications of the English Goethe Society*, 81 (2012), pp. 51-72.

Kolchinsky, E., Hossfeld, U., and Levit, G. S., 'Russian scientists and the Royal Society of London: 350 years of scientific collaboration', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, https://doi.org/10.1098/rsnr.2017.0001, accessed 8 September 2018.

Korshin, P. J., 'Types of eighteenth-century literary patronage', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 7 (1974), pp. 453-473.

Kosenina, A., and Robertson, R., 'Lessing as journalist and controversialist', in Richie Robertson, ed, *Lessing and the German enlightenment* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 39-64.

Krake, A.. '"Translating to the moment' – marking and Anglomania: the first German translation of Richardson's Clarissa (1747/1748)' in Stefanie Stockhorst, ed, *Cultural transfer through translation: The circulation of enlightened through in Europe by means of translation* (Amsterdam and New York, 2010), pp. 103-120.

Kuehn, M., 'The early reception of Reid, Oswald, and Beattie in Germany: 1768-1800', *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 21 (1983), pp. 479-496.

----------., *Scottish common sense in Germany, 1768-1800: A contribution to the history of critical philosophy* (Kingston and Montreal, 1987).

----------., 'Kant's critique of Hume's theory of faith', in M. A. Stewart and John P. Wright, eds, Hume and Hume's connexions (Edinburgh, 1994), pp. 239-255.

----------., 'Introduction', in Heiner F. Klemme and Manfred Kuehn, eds, *The reception of British aesthetics in Germany: Seven significant translations, 1745-1776*, Vol. 1 (Bristol, 2001), pp. x-xx.

----------., *Kant: A biography* (Cambridge, 2002).

----------., 'The reception of Hume in Germany', in Peter Jones, ed, *The reception of David Hume in Europe* (London and New York, 2005), pp. 98-138.

Langford, P., *A polite and commercial people: England, 1727-1783* (Oxford, 1989).

Laursen, J. C., and Richard Popkin, with a French translation by Peter Briscoe, 'Hume in the Prussian academy: Jean Bernard Mérian's 'On the phenomenalism of David Hume'', *Hume Studies*, 1 (1997), pp. 153-162.

Lehleiter, C., 'Introduction: Fact and fiction: Literary and scientific cultures in Germany and

Britain – Thoughts on a contentious relationship' in Christine Lehleiter, ed, *Fact and Fiction: Literary and scientific cultures in Germany and Britain* (Toronto, Buffalo and London, 2016), pp. 1-30.

Lemmings, D., *Gentlemen and barristers: The Inns of Court and the English bar 1680-1730* (Oxford, 1990).

----------., *Professors of the law: Barristers and English legal culture in the eighteenth century* (Oxford, 2000).

Lenman, B., 'A client society: Scotland between the '15 and the '45', in Jeremy Black, ed, *Britain in the age of Walpole* (Houndmills and London, 1984), pp. 69-94.

Levine, J. M., 'Why neoclassicism? Politics and culture in eighteenth-century England', *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 25 (2002), pp. 75-101.

Lim, S., 'Frederick the Great and Jean le Rond d'Alembert on philosophy, truth, and politics', *The Historical Journal*, 2 (2018), pp. 357-378.

Lindgren, L., 'Handel's London – Italian musicians and librettists', in Donald Burrows, ed, *The Cambridge companion to Handel* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 78-91.

Lodge, R., 'An episode in Anglo-Russian relations during the War of the Austrian Succession', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 9 (1926), pp. 63-83.

----------., 'Presidential address: The mission of Henry Legge to Berlin, 1748', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 14 (1931), pp. 1-38.

Löffler, K., *Anthropologische Konzeptionen in der Literatur der Aufklärung: Autoren in Leipzig 1730-1760* (Leipzig, 2005).

Loftis, J., 'Thomson's Tancred and Sigismunda and the demise of the drama of political opposition', in George Winchester Stone, ed, *The Stage and the page: London's 'whole show' in the eighteenth-century theatre* (Los Angeles and London, 1981), pp. 34-54.

Louden, R. B., 'A writer more excellent than Cicero: Hume's influence on Kant's anthropology', in Elizabeth Robinson and Chris W. Suprenant, eds, *Kant and the Scottish enlightenment* (New York and Abingdon, 2017), pp. 164-180.

Lund, R. D., *Jonathan Swift's Gulliver's Travels: A Routledge study guide* (Abingdon and New York, 2006).

Maas, A., 'Civil scientists: Dutch scientists between 1750 and 1875', *History of Science*, 48 (2010), pp. 75-103.

Maber, R., '*Réseaux diplomatiques et République des lettres: les correspondants de Sir Joseph Williamson (1660-1680)*. Par Alexandre Tessier', *French Studies*, 70 (2016), pp. 432-433.

MacDonogh, G., *Frederick the Great: A Life in Deed and Letters* (London, 1999).

MacGregor, A., 'Forming an identity: The early Society and its context, 1707-1751', in Susan Pearce, ed, *Visions of antiquity: The Society of Antiquaries of London 1707-2007* (London, 2007), pp. 45-74.

Maddison, F., 'Early astronomical and mathematical instruments: A brief survey of sources and modern studies', *History of Science*, 2 (1963), pp. 17-50.

Maling, D. H., "A little, round, fat, oily man of God: Rev Patrick Murdoch and his contributions to eighteenth-century cartography and geography', *Cartographic Journal*, 20 (1983), pp. 110-118.

Marks, S. K., *Sir Charles Grandison: The compleat conduct book* (Lewisburg, London and Toronto, 1986).

Maurer, M., *Aufklärung und Anglophilie in Deutschland* (Göttingen and Zürich, 1987).

Maurer, M., 'Germany's image of eighteenth-century England', in Joseph Canning and Hermann Wellenreuther, eds, *Britain and Germany compared: Nationality, society and nobility in the eighteenth century* (Göttingen, 2001), pp. 15-36.

Mayhew, R., 'Mapping science's imagined community: Geography as a Republic of Letters, 1600-1800', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, 38 (2005), pp. 73-92.

Mazzotti, M., 'Newton for ladies: gentility, gender and radical culture', *British Journal for the History of Science*, 37 (2004), pp. 119-146.

McGeary, T., *The politics of opera in Handel's Britain* (Cambridge, 2013).

McGill, W. J., 'The Roots of policy: Kaunitz in Vienna and Versailles, 1749-1753', *The Journal of Modern History*, 43 (1971), pp. 228-244.

McKay, D., and Scott, H. M., *The rise of the great powers 1648-1815* (London and New York, 1983).

McKie, D., 'Antoine Laurent Lavoisier, F.R.S. 1743-1794', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, 7 (1949), pp. 1-41.

McKitterick, D., *A History of the Cambridge University Press*, Vol. 2, *Scholarship and Commerce 1698-1872* (Cambridge, 1998).

McMurran, M. H., 'Contemporary transnational reception', in Peter Sabor and Betty A. Schellenberg, eds, *Samuel Richardson in context* (Cambridge, 2017), pp. 37-44.

Meise, J., *Lessings Anglophilie* (Frankfurt am Main, 1997).

Mijers, E., *'News from the Republick of Letters': Scottish students, Charles Mackie and the United Provinces, 1650-1750* (Leiden and Boston, 2012).

Miller, D. P., "Into the valley of darkness: Reflections on the Royal Society in the eighteenth century', *History of Science*, 27 (1989), pp. 155-166.

----------., 'The 'Hardwick Circle': The Whig supremacy and its demise in the 18th century

Royal Society', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, 52 (1998), pp. 73-91.

----------., 'The usefulness of natural philosophy: The Royal Society and the culture of practical utility in the later eighteenth century', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, 32 (1999), pp. 185-201.

Millburn, J. R., *Benjamin Martin: Author, instrument-maker, and 'country showman'* (Leyden, 1976).

Miller, J., *Early modern Britain, 1450-1750* (Cambridge, 2017).

Mitchison, R., *Lordship to patronage. Scotland 1603-1745* (London, 1983).

Moore, Jr., T. O., 'Introduction', in George Turnbull, *Observations upon liberal education, in all its branches* (1742), ed, Terrence O. Moore, Jr (Indianapolis, 2003), pp. ix-xix.

Mori, J., *The culture of diplomacy: Britain in Europe, c. 1750-1830* (Manchester and New York, 2010).

Mossner, E. C., 'Hume's 'Four Dissertations': An essay in biography and bibliography', *Modern Philology*, 48 (1950), pp. 37-57.

----------., *The Life of David Hume*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1980).

Mühlbach, L., *Frederick the Great and his family: An historical novel*, trans. Mrs. Chapman Coleman and her daughters (New York, 1895).

Murdoch, A., 'Scotland and the union', in H. T. Dickinson, ed, *A companion to eighteenth-century Britain* (Malden and Oxford, 2002), pp. 381-391.

Namier, L., *The structure of politics at the accession of George III*, 2 vols., Vol. 1 (London, 1929).

Nenadic, S., 'Introduction', in Stana Nenadic, ed, *Scots in London in the eighteenth century* (Lewisburg, 2010), pp. 13-45.

Newman, G., *The rise of English nationalism: A cultural history, 1740-1830* (London, 1987).

----------., ed, *Britain in the Hanoverian age: An encyclopedia* (New York and London, 1997).

Nisbet, H. B., *Lessing: Eine Biographie* (Munich, 2008).

----------., 'Lessing's achievement', in Ritchie Robertson, ed, *Lessing and the German Enlightenment* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 1-14.

----------., *Gotthold Ephraim Lessing: His life, works, and thought* (Oxford, 2013).

Oates, J., 'Sir Robert Walpole after his fall from power', *History*, 91 (2006), pp. 218-230.

Ogborn, M., and Withers, C. W. J., 'Introduction: Georgian geographies?' in Miles Ogborn and Charles W. J. Withers, eds, *Georgian geographies: Essays on space, place and landscape in the eighteenth century* (Manchester and New York, 2004), pp. 1-23.

O'Gorman, F., *The long eighteenth century: British political and social history 1688-1832*, 2nd ed (London and New York, 2016).

Ophir, A., and Shapin, S., 'The Place of knowledge: A methodological survey', *Science in context*, 4 (1991), pp. 3-21.

Oppel, H., *English-deutsche Literaturbeziehungen*, Vol. 1, *Von den Anfängen bis zum Ausgang des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1971).

Orchiston, W., *Exploring the history of New Zealand astronomy: Trials, tribulations, telescopes and transits* (Dordrecht, 2016).

Orland, B., 'Repositories and treasure troves of knowledge', *Uni Nova: Research Magazine of the University of Basel,* 122 (2013), pp. 15-16.

Osborne, C., *The opera lover's companion* (New Haven and London, 2007).

Outram, D., *Panorama of the enlightenment* (Los Angeles, 2006).

----------., 'Placing the enlightenment: Thinking geographically about the age of reason by Charles W. J. Withers', *The Journal of Modern History*, 81 (2009), pp. 649-651.

----------., *The Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 2013).

Oz-Salzberger, F., 'Scottish political ideas in eighteenth century Germany: The case of Adam Ferguson', PhD Diss., University of Oxford (Oxford, 1991).

Patrick, D. J., and Whatley, C. A., 'Persistence, principle and patriotism in the making of the union of 1707: The revolution, Scottish parliament and the squadrone volante', *History*, 92 (2007), pp. 162-186.

Pearce, E., *Pitt the elder: Man of war* (London, 2010).

Pearson, H., *Boswell and Johnson: The story of their lives* (London, 1958).

Peers, D. M., 'Army discipline, military cultures, and state-formation' in H. V. Bowen, Elizabeth Mancke, and John G. Reid, eds, *Britain's oceanic empire: Atlantic and Indian Ocean worlds, c. 1550-1850* (Cambridge, 2012), pp. 282-308.

Pentland, G., "We speak for the ready': Images of Scots in political prints, 1707-1832', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 90 (2011), pp. 64-95.

Peters, M., *The elder Pitt* (Harlow, 1998).

Philip, J. R., 'Samuel Johnson as Antiscientist', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, 29 (1975), pp. 193-203.

Phillips, D., 'Francis Bacon and the Germans: Stories from when 'science' meant 'Wissenschaft'', *History of Science*, 53 (2015), pp. 378-394.

Pittock, M., 'Treacherous objects: Towards a theory of Jacobite material culture', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 34 (2011), pp. 39-63.

Porter, R., *Enlightenment: Britain and the creation of the modern world* (London, 2000).

----------., 'Introduction', in Roy Porter, ed, *The Cambridge history of science*, Vol. 4, *Eighteenth-century science* (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 1-22.

Prest, W. R., *The rise of the barristers: A social history of the English bar 1590-1640* (Oxford, 1986).

Price, J. V., 'The reading of philosophical literature', in Isabel Rivers, ed, *Books and their readers in eighteenth-century England* (New York, 1982), pp. 165-196.

Ratcliff, M. J., *The quest for the invisible: Microscopy in the enlightenment* (London and New York, 2009).

Redford, B., "Grecian taste and Roman spirit': The Society of Dilettanti on classic ground', in Philip Thibodeau and Harry Haskell, eds, *Being there together: Essays in honor of Michael C. J. Putnam on the occasion of his seventieth birthday* (Minnesota, 2003), pp. 258-274.

----------., "Seria Ludo': George Knapton's portraits of the Society of Dilettanti', *The British Art Journal*, 3 (2001), pp. 56-68.

----------., *Dilettanti: The antic and the antique in eighteenth-century England* (Los Angeles, 2008).

Reimann, K. E., "Es ist ein köstlich Ding geduldig sein.' Die Edition der nachgelassenen Schriften Christian Fürchtegott Gellerts', in Sibylle Schönborn and Vera Viehöver, eds, *Gellert und die empfindsame Aufklärung: Vermittlungs-, Austausch- und Rezeptionsprozesse in Wissenschaft, Kunst und Kultur* (Berlin, 2009), pp. 285-299.

Richards, A., 'The era of sensibility and the novel of self-fashioning', in Barbara Becker-Cantarino, ed, *German literature of the eighteenth century: The enlightenment and sensibility* (Rochester, NY and Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 223-244.

Rickman, H. P., ed and trans., *W. Dilthey. Selected writings* (Cambridge, 1976).

Riley, M., 'Cultivating the savage: Johann Georg Sulzer and the 'aesthetic force' of music', *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 127 (2002), pp. 1-22.

Riotte, T., 'George III and Hanover', in Brendan Simms and Torsten Riotte, eds, *The Hanoverian dimension in British history, 1714-1837* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 58-85.

Rivers, I., *Reason, grace and sentiment: A study of the language of religion and ethics in England 1660-1780*, Vol. 2, *Shaftesbury to Hume* (Cambridge, 2000).

Roberts, R. J., 'Towards a short-title catalogue of English eighteenth century books', *Journal of Librarianship*, 2 (1970), pp. 246-262.

Robinson, F. J. G., and Wallis, P. J., *Book subscription lists. A revised guide* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1975).

Roche, D., *France in the enlightenment,* trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge, MA and London, 1998).

Rousseau, G., 'Science books and their readers in the eighteenth century', in Isabel Rivers, ed, *Books and their readers in eighteenth-century England* (Leicester, 1982), pp. 197-256.

Rusnock, A., 'Correspondence networks and the Royal Society, 1700-1750', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, 32 (1999), pp. 155-169.

Sankey, M., and Szechi, D., 'Elite culture and the decline of Scottish Jacobitism 1716-1745', *Past & Present*, 173 (2001), pp. 90-128.

Sankey, M., *Jacobite prisoners of the 1715 rebellion* (Burlington, 2005).

Saunders, R. H., *John Smibert: Colonial America's first portrait painter* (New Haven and London, 1995).

Saussure, R., de, 'Haller and La Mettrie', *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*, 4 (1949), pp. 431-449.

Schaffer, S., 'In transit: European cosmologies in the Pacific', in Kate Fullagar, ed, *The Atlantic world in the antipodes: Effects and transformations since the eighteenth century* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 2012), pp. 70-93.

Schatzberg, W., *Scientific themes in the popular literature and the poetry of the German enlightenment, 1720-1760* (Bern, 1973).

Schiebinger, L., *The mind has no sex? Women in the origins of modern science* (Cambridge, MA and London, 1989).

Schieder, T., *Frederick the Great*, ed. and trans. Sabina Berkeley and H. M. Scott (London and New York, 2000).

Schmidt, A., 'Scholarship, morals and government: Jean-Henri-Samuel Formey's and Johann Gottfried Herder's responses to Rousseau's First Discourse', *Modern Intellectual History*, 9 (2012), pp. 249-274.

Schmidt, E., *Lessing. Sein Leben und seine Schriften* (Hildesheim, Zürich and New York, 1983).

Schneider, L., *Geschichte der Opera und des Königlichen Opernhauses in Berlin* (Berlin, 1852).

Schönborn, S., *Das Buch der Seele. Tagebuchliteratur zwischen Aufklärung und Kunstperiode* (Tübingen, 1999), pp. 64-85.

Schuchard, M. K., *Emanuel Swedenborg, secret agent on Earth and in Heaven: Jacobites, Jews and Freemasons in early modern Sweden* (Leiden and Boston, 2012).

Schui, F., 'Taxpayer opposition and fiscal reform in Prussia, c. 1766-1787', *Historical Journal*, 54 (2011), pp. 371-399.

----------., *Rebellious Prussians: Urban political culture under Frederick the Great and his successors* (Oxford, 2013).

Schumann, M., and Schweizer, K. W., *The Seven Years War: A transatlantic history* (London and New York, 2008).

Schweizer, K. W., 'A lost letter of John Stuart, 3rd earl of Bute, to George Grenville, 13 October 1761', *The Historical Journal*, 17 (1974), pp. 435-442.

----------., 'Lord Bute, Newcastle, Prussia, and the Hague overtures: A re-examination',

Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies, 9 (1977), pp. 72-97.

----------., *Lord Bute: Essays in re-interpretation* (Leicester, 1988).

----------., 'The early years of Sir Andrew Mitchell (1708-1771): A biographical addendum', *Scottish Tradition*, 15 (1989), pp. 51-54.

----------., *England, Prussia and the Seven Years War* (Lewiston, Queenston and Lampeter, 1989).

----------., 'An unpublished parliamentary speech by the elder Pitt, 9 December 1761', *Historical Research*, 64 (1991), pp. 92-105.

----------., *Frederick the Great, William Pitt, and Lord Bute: The Anglo-Prussian Alliance, 1756-1763* (New York and London, 1991).

----------., *William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, 1708-1778: A bibliography* (Westport, 1993).

----------., and Leonard, C. S., 'Britain, Prussia, Russia, and the Galitzin letter: A reassessment', *The Historical Journal*, 26 (1983), pp. 531-556.

Scott, H. M., '"The true principles of the Revolution": The Duke of Newcastle and the idea of the old system', in Jeremy Black, ed, *Knights errant and true Englishmen: British foreign policy, 1660-1800* (Edinburgh, 1989), pp. 55-91.

----------., *British foreign policy in the age of the American Revolution* (Oxford, 1990).

----------., 'The rise of the first minister in eighteenth-century Europe', in T. C. W. Blanning & David Cannadine, eds, *History and Biography: Essays in Honour of Derek Beales* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 21-52.

----------., 'Prussia's royal foreign minister: Frederick the Great and the administration of Prussian diplomacy', in Robert Oresko, G. C. Gibbs and H. M. Scott, eds, *Royal and republican sovereignty in early modern Europe: essays in memory of Ragnhild Hatton* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 500-526.

----------., *The emergence of the eastern powers, 1756-1775* (Cambridge, 2001).

----------., *The birth of a great power system 1740-1815* (Harlow, 2006).

Shackleton, R., *Montesquieu: A critical biography* (Oxford, 1961).

Shapin, S., 'Placing the view from nowhere: historical and sociological problems in the location of science', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 23 (1998), pp. 5-12.

Sharp, P., 'Herbert Butterfield, the English School and the civilising virtues of diplomacy', *International Affairs*, 79 (2003), pp. 855-878.

Shaw, J. S., *The management of Scottish society 1707-1764: Power, nobles, lawyers, Edinburgh agents and English influences* (Edinburgh, 1983).

Shaw, J. S., *The political history of eighteenth-century Scotland* (Houndmills and London, 1999).

Shellabager, S., *Lord Chesterfield and his world* (New York, 1971).

Sher, R. B., *The Enlightenment and the book: Scottish authors and their publishers in eighteenth-century Britain, Ireland & America* (Chicago and London, 2008).

Sherrard, O. A., *Lord Chatham: A war minister in the making* (London, 1952).

----------., *Lord Chatham: Pitt and the Seven Years War* (London, 1955).

Shields, J., 'Smollett's Scots and sodomites: British masculinity in Roderick Random', *The Eighteenth Century*, 46 (2005)', pp. 175-188.

Simms, B., *The impact of Napoleon: Prussian high politics, foreign policy and the crisis of the executive, 1797-1806* (Cambridge, 1997).

----------., Three victories and a defeat: The rise and fall of the first British empire, 1714-1783 (New York, 2007).

----------., 'Pitt and Hanover', in Brendan Simms and Torsten Riotte, eds, *The Hanoverian dimension in British history, 1714-1837* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 28-57.

----------., 'British strategic culture, 1714-1760', in Hamish Scott and Brendan Simms, eds, *Cultures of power in Europe during the long eighteenth century* (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 110-132.

----------., Britain's Europe: A thousand years of conflict and cooperation (London, 2016).

Smeall, C., 'How to become a renowned writer: Francesco Algarotti (1712-1764) and the uses of networking in eighteenth-century Europe', PhD. Diss., McGill University, 2010.

Smith, A., 'The Forfeited Estates Papers, 1745: A study of the work of the Commissioners for the Forfeited Annexed Estates, 1755-1784, with particular reference to their contribution to the development of communications in Scotland in the eighteenth century', PhD. Diss., University of St Andrews (1975).

Smith H., and Taylor, S., 'Hephaestion and Alexander: Lord Hervey, Frederick, Prince of Wales, and the royal favourite in England in the 1730s', *The English Historical Review*, 124 (2009), pp. 283-312.

Smith, M. G., 'J. H. S. Formey, assiduous journalist and discreet propagandist of new scientific discoveries and philosophical trends', *Archives et Bibliotheques de Belgique*, 54 (1983), pp. 123-140.

----------., 'In defence of an eighteenth-century academician, philosopher and journalist: Jean-Henri Samuel Formey', Studies on Voltaire and the eighteenth century, Vol. 311 (Geneva, 1993), pp. 85-100.

Smith, R. W., 'The Cambridge network in action: The discovery of Neptune', Isis, 80 (1989), pp. 395-422.

Smout, T. C., 'The culture of migration: Scots as Europeans, 1500-1800', *History Workshop*

Journal, 40 (1995), pp. 108-117.

Snyder, J. P., *Flattening the earth: Two thousand years of map projections* (Chicago and London, 1997).

Sobel, D., *Longitude: The true story of a lone genius who solved the greatest scientific problem of his time* (London, 1995).

Sonenscher, M., *Sans-culottes: An eighteenth-century emblem in the French Revolution* (Princeton, 2008).

Sorensen, J., *The grammar of empire in eighteenth-century British writing* (Cambridge, 2000).

Sorrenson, R., 'Towards a history of the Royal Society in the eighteenth century', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, 50 (1996), pp. 29-46.

----------., 'George Graham, visible technician', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, 32 (1999), pp. 203-221.

----------., 'Dollond & son's pursuit of achromaticity, 1758-1789', *History of Science*, 39 (2001), pp. 31-58.

Speck, W., 'Whigs and Tories dim their glories: English political parties under the first two Georges', in John Cannon, ed, *The Whig ascendancy: Colloquies on Hanoverian* England (London, 1981), pp. 51-76.

----------., 'Politicians, peers, and publication by subscription 1700-1750', in Isabel Rivers, ed, *Books and their readers in eighteenth-century England* (New York, 1982), pp. 47-68.

Stephenson, R. H., 'Weimar classicism's debt to the Scottish enlightenment', in Nicholas Boyle and John Guthrie, eds, *Goethe and the English-speaking world: Essays from the Cambridge Symposium for his 250th anniversary* (Rochester, NY and Woodbridge, 2002), pp. 61-70.

Stewart, M. A., 'Berkeley and the Rankenian Club', *Hermathena*, 139 (Winter 1985), pp. 25-45.

Stewart, M. A., and Wood, P., 'Introduction', in George Turnbull, *Education for life: Correspondence and writings on religion and practical philosophy*, ed. M. A. Stewart and Paul Wood (Indianapolis, 2014), pp. i-xxxii.

Straubel, R., *Biographisches Handbuch der preußischen Verwaltungs- und Justizbeamten 1740-1806/15*, Part 1, *Biographien A-L* (München, 2009).

Sutton, G. V., *Science for a polite society: Gender, culture, and the demonstration of enlightenment* (Boulder and Oxford, 1995).

Sweet, R., *Antiquaries: The discovery of the past in eighteenth-century Britain* (London and New York, 2004).

Swenson, R., 'Revising the Scottish plot in Tobias Smollett's *Roderick Random*', in Christopher D. Johnson, ed, *New contexts for eighteenth-century British fiction: 'Hearts resolved and hands prepared'. Essays in honor of Jerry C. Beasley* (Lanham, 2011), pp. 177-200.

Swenson, R., *Essential Scots and the idea of unionism in Anglo-Scottish literature, 1603-1832* (Lewisburg, 2016).

Swindells, J., 'The political context of the 1737 Licensing Act', in Julia Swindells and David Francis Taylor, eds, *The Oxford handbook of the Georgian theatre, 1737-1832* (Oxford, 2014), pp. 107-122.

Szabo, F. A. J., *The Seven Years War in Europe, 1756-1763* (London and New York, 2008).

Tayler, A. N., and Tayler, H., *A Jacobite exile* (London, 1937).

Terrall, M., 'The culture of science in Frederick the Great's Berlin', *History of Science*, 28 (1990), pp. 333-364.

The Earl of Ilchester and Mrs Langford-Brooke, *The life of Sir Charles Hanbury Williams: Poet, wit and diplomatist* (London, 1929).

Thiel, U., *The early modern subject: Self-consciousness and personal identity from Descartes to Hume* (Oxford, 2011).

Thomas, D., 'The 1737 Licensing Act and its impact', in Julia Swindells and David Francis Taylor, eds, *The Oxford handbook of the Georgian theatre, 1737-1832* (Oxford, 2014), pp. 91-106.

Thomas, P. D. G., *The House of Commons in the eighteenth century* (Oxford, 1971).

Tilley, A. A., *Three French dramatists: Racine, Marivaux, Musset* (Cambridge, 1933).

Tinker, C. B., *The salon and English letters: Chapters on the interrelations of literature and society in the age of Johnson* (New York, 1915).

Trapnell, W. H., *Eavesdropping in Marivaux* (Geneva, 1987).

Turner, G. L'E., 'The auction sales of the earl of Bute's instruments, 1793', *Annals of Science*, 23 (1967), pp. 213-242.

----------., 'The history of optical instruments: A brief survey of sources and modern studies', *History of Science*, 8 (1969), pp. 53-93.

----------.,'James Short, F. R. S., and his contribution to the construction of reflecting telescopes', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, 24 (1969), pp. 91-108.

----------., *Nineteenth-century scientific instruments* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1983).

----------., *Scientific instruments 1500-1900: An introduction* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1998).

Urbach, K., 'Diplomatic history since the cultural turn', *The Historical Journal,* 46 (2003), pp. 991-997.

Venuti, L., *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*, 2nd ed. (London and New York, 2008).

Verdicchio, M., 'Concerning Ariosto's modernity: Alcina's case', in Jonathan Hart, ed, *Imagining*

culture: Essays in early modern history and literature (New York and London, 1996), pp. 151-164.

Volz, G. B., *Friedrich der Große im Spiegel seiner Zeit*, Vol. 2, *Siebenjähriger Krieg und Folgezeit bis 1778* (Berlin, 1901).

----------., *Friedrich der Große im Spiegel seiner Zeit*, Vol. 3, *Geistesleben, Alter und Tod* (Berlin, 1901).

Waldmann, F., ed, *Further letters of David Hume* (Edinburgh, 2014).

Wallis, P. J., 'The book subscription lists project – its relevance for historians of mathematics', *Historia Mathematica*, 2 (1975), pp. 312-326.

----------., 'Book subscription lists', *The Library*, 29 (1974), pp. 256-286.

Walmsley, P., *The rhetoric of Berkeley's philosophy* (Cambridge, 1990).

Walsh, M., 'Swift's Tale of a Tub and the mock book', in Paddy Bullard and James McLaverty, eds, *Jonathan Swift and the eighteenth-century book* (Cambridge, 2013), pp. 101-118.

Waxman, W., *Kant and the empiricists: Understanding understanding* (Oxford, 2005).

Whitley, L. A. B., *A great grievance: Ecclesiastical lay patronage in Scotland until 1750* (Eugene, 2013).

Wiener, P. P., 'Communication: Did Hume ever read Berkeley?', *The Journal of Philosophy*, 58 (1961), pp. 327-328.

Wiles, R. M., *Serial publication in England before 1750* (Cambridge, 1957).

Williams, B., *The Whig supremacy 1714-1760*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1962).

Williams, E. A., *A cultural history of medical vitalism in enlightenment Montpellier* (Aldershot and Burlington, 2003).

Wilson, K., *The sense of the people: Politics, culture and imperialism in England, 1715-1785* (Cambridge, 1995).

Withers, C. W. J., 'Introduction: Georgian geographies?' in Miles Ogborn and Charles W. J. Withers, eds, *Georgian geographies: Essays on space, place and landscape in the eighteenth century* (Manchester and New York, 2004), pp. 1-23.

----------., *Placing the enlightenment: Thinking geographically about the age of reason* (Chicago and London, 2007).

----------., 'Place and the 'spatial turn' in geography and in history', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 70 (2009), pp. pp. 637-658.

----------., 'Space, geography, and the global French enlightenment', in Daniel Brewer, ed, The Cambridge companion to the French enlightenment (Cambridge, 2014), pp. 214-232.

Witte, B., 'Der Dichter und der Kriegsherr', in Sibylle Schönborn and Vera Viehöver, eds,

Gellert und die empfindsame Aufklärung: Vermittlungs-, Austausch- und Rezeptionsprozesse in Wissenschaft, Kunst und Kultur (Berlin, 2009), pp. 67-82.

Woolf, H., *The transits of Venus: A study of eighteenth-century science* (Princeton, 1959).

Young, B. W., *The Victorian eighteenth century: An intellectual history* (Oxford, 2007).

Zande, J., van der, 'Orpheus in Berlin: A reappraisal of Johann Georg Sulzer's theory of the polite arts', *Central European History*, 28 (1995), pp. 175-208.

Zande, J., van der, 'Johann Georg Sulzer's Allgemeine Theorie der Schönen Künste, in Carsten Zelle, ed, *Das Achtzehnte Jahrhundert. Zeitschrift der Deutschen Gesellschaft für die Erforschung des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts: Enzyklopädien, Lexika und Wörterbucher im 18. Jahrhundert* (Wolfenbüttel, 1998), pp. 87-102.

Zande, J., van der, 'Prussia and the enlightenment' in Philip G. Dwyer, ed, *The Rise of Prussia 1700-1830* (Harlow, 2000), pp. 89-107.

Zaretsky R., and Scott, J., *The Philosophers' quarrel: Rousseau, Hume, and the limits of human understanding* (New Haven and London, 2009).

Zimmerman, D., *The Jacobite movement in Scotland and in exile, 1746-1759* (Houndmills and London, 2003).

Zuidervaart, H. J., "A plague to the learned world': Pieter Gabry, F. R. S. (1715-1770) and his use of natural philosophy to gain prestige and social status', *History of Science*, 45 (2007), pp. 287-326.

Websites

Bobzin, H., 'Reiske, Johann Jacob', in NDB, at https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd100317278.html#ndbcontent, accessed 1 March 2018.

d'Aprile, I-M., 'Friedrich und die Netzwerke der Wissenschaften', in Michael Kaiser and Jürgen Luh, eds, Friedrich der Große und der Hof. Beiträge des zweiten Colloquiums in der Reihe "Friedrich300" vom 10./11. Oktober 2008 (Friedrich300 – Colloquien, 2), at http://www.perspectivia.net/publikationen/friedrich300-colloquien/friedrich-kulturtransfer/daprile_netzwerke, accessed 2 August 2017.

'Founders Online' at https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Franklin/01-10-02-0043

Haden-Guest, Lady E., 'Mitchell, Andrew (1708-71), of Thainston, Aberdeen' at http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1715-1754/member/mitchell-andrew-1708-71, accessed 22 August 2018.

Haden-Guest, Lady E., 'Mitchell, Andrew (1708-71), of Thainston, Aberdeen' at

http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1754-1790/member/mitchell-andrew-1708-71, accessed 13 September 2017.

Hirsch, A., 'Lieberkühn, Johann Nathanael', in Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie, 18 (1883), pp. 576-577, at https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd104196645.html#adbcontent, accessed 11 January 2018.

Koch, P., 'Ludovici, Carl Günther', in NDB, at https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd117281387.html#ndbcontent, accessed 1 March 2018.

Kohl, K., 'Die Berliner Akademie als Medium des Kulturtransfers im Kontext der europäischen Aufklärung', in Michael Kaiser and Jürgen Luh, eds, Friedrich der Große und der Hof. Beiträge des zweiten Colloquiums in der Reihe "Friedrich300" vom 10./11. Oktober 2008 (Friedrich300 – Colloquien, 2), at http://www.perspectivia.net/publikationen/friedrich300-colloquien/friedrich-kulturtransfer/kohl_akademie, accessed 2 August 2017.

Lea, R. S., 'Forbes, Sir Arthur, 4th Bt. (1709-73), of Craigievar, Aberdeen', at http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1715-1754/member/forbes-sir-arthur-1709-73, accessed 15 August 2018.

Liebmann, O., 'Winckler, Johann Heinrich', in Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie, 43 (1898), at https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd117582115.html#adbcontent, accessed 1 March 2018.

Lorandi, G., 'Théodore Tronchin, doctor to the stars', History Today, 3 March 2018, at https://www.historytoday.com/giacomo-lorandi/th%C3%A9odore-tronchin-doctor-stars, accessed 3 July 2018.

Müller, J. W., 'Sulzer, Johann Georg', in Neue Deutsche Biographie, 25 (2013), pp. 702-703, at https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz22694.html#ndbcontent, accessed 9 January 2018.

Obser, K., 'Edelsheim, Georg Ludwig Freiherr von', in Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie 48 (1904), pp. 261-262, at www.deutsche-biographie.de/gnd116355085.html#adbcontent, accessed 31 July 2017.

Rüdinger, N., 'Meckel of Hemsbach, Johann Friedrich', in Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie 21 (1885), pp. 159-162, at https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz59698.html#adbcontent, accessed 31 July 2017.

Simpson, J. M., and Lea, R. S., 'Anstruther, Philip (c. 1680-1760), of Airdrie, Fife', in The

History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1715-1754, ed. R. Sedgwick (1970), at http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1715-1754/member/anstruther-philip-1680-1760, accessed 2 November 2017.

Terne, C., 'Friedrich II. von Preußen und die Hofoper', in Michael Kaiser and Jürgen Luh, eds, Friedrich der Große und der Hof. Beiträge des zweiten Colloquiums in der Reihe "Friedrich300" vom 10./11. Oktober 2008 (Friedrich300 – Colloquien, 2), at http://www.perspectivia.net/publikationen/friedrich300-colloquien/friedrich-hof/Terne_Hofoper, accessed 2 August 2017.

The University of Glasgow, 'William Rouet', at http://www.universitystory.gla.ac.uk/biography/?id=WH2238&type=P, accessed 3 August 2017.

Wharton, W. J. L., ed, Captain Cook's Journal during his first voyage round the world made in H. M. bark 'Endeavour' 1768-71 (London, 1893), at http://gutenberg.net.au/ebooks/e00043.html, accessed 7 January 2018.

ODNB Entries

Clarke, T., 'Stuart, Andrew (1725-1801)', *ODNB*.

Clifton, G., 'Dollond family', *ODNB*.

Cochran, B., B., 'Wallace, Robert (1697-1771)', *ODNB*.

Dunhill, 'Harris, James (1709-1780)', *ODNB*.

Handley, S., 'Stewart, John (c. 1700-1747)', *ODNB*.

King, T., 'Harrison, John (bap. 1693, d. 1776)', *ODNB*.

Page, F. G., 'Lewis, William (bap. 1708, d. 1781)', *ODNB*.

Pollard, A. F., *rev.* M. J. Mercer, 'Stone, Andrew (1703-1773)', *ODNB*.

Powell, M. J., 'Roberts, John (1711/12-1772)', *ODNB*.

Ross, I. C., 'Douglas, John (1721-1807)', *ODNB*.

Sellers, I., 'Clarke, Adam (1762-1832)', *ODNB*.

Smitten, J. R., 'Robertson, William (1721-1793)', *ODNB*.

Steele, B. D., 'Robins, Benjamin (1707-1751)', *ODNB*.

Stewart, M. M., 'Williams, Sir Charles Hanbury (1708-1759)', *ODNB*.

Towse, C., 'Conway, Henry Seymour (1719-1795)', *ODNB*.